

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVI

JANUARY, 1928

No. 91

EDITORIAL

THE decision of the House of Commons to reject the Prayer-Book resolution came as a great surprise; though the character of the debate, in such sharp contrast with the dignity and thoroughness of that in the House of Lords, showed once and for all how ill-adapted are the Commons for handling matters of this kind. We regard the decision as the Church's Coronel, necessary for the Falkland Islands victory that must follow—namely, a new Concordat between Church and State, restoring to the Church its freedom in spiritual things. At all costs the Church must retain the initiative now in its hands. The great bulk of Churchmen have taken the measure of what lies behind the Commons' vote and are not dismayed by it. Their chief regret, we think, will be in the thought of the inevitable disappointment caused to the Archbishop of Canterbury. But we doubt not that it will be mitigated for him by the knowledge of the love and trust felt for him in unexampled degree by Church people in all parts of the world. The news comes only as we go to press; and further consideration must be postponed to next month's issue.

By the death of the Dean of Salisbury the Church has lost one of its most learned scholars, and THEOLOGY one of its best friends. From the inception of this Journal he had been of constant help to us both as a writer and as a counsellor; and his regular reviews of French and Belgian periodicals, inspired as they were by an eager desire for the unity of the Church, were a contribution which it will be difficult to replace. He combined in rare degree the patience of pastoral care with the humility of real learning; and we are glad to publish in this month's Miscellanea a letter which well illustrates the qualities of a man rightly beloved. R.I.P.

EVOLUTION AND THE FAITH

CERTAIN subjects seem to arouse public interest at recurrent intervals, and of these the scientific hypothesis of evolution is among the most conspicuous. Thus seven years ago a sermon was preached at the British Association Meeting at Cardiff on the relation of the theory to the theological doctrine of the Fall. The preacher has since told us that this sermon went round the world and brought him over a thousand letters. This is all the more remarkable inasmuch as the sermon in question made no striking or original contribution to the problem, being merely a statement in rather controversial terms of the obvious discrepancy between the creation stories in Genesis regarded as historical records, and the evolutionary view of the origin of species, human and other, now adopted by the biological sciences. The voluminous correspondence in the Press which ensued testified to the widespread interest in creation theories in relation to current religious beliefs, and therefore for the need of a restatement of the Christian dogmas involved to readjust them with the duly ascertained scientific facts. Having this end in view, I ventured in two articles published in this journal in 1921 to put together a few thoughts on the problem of the Origin and Fall of Man in the light of the available anthropological evidence. Now recent events have reopened the controversy, Sir Arthur Keith at the last meeting of the British Association having selected for the subject of his presidential address the present position of Darwin's theory of the Descent of Man. This, of course, was calculated to provide excellent "copy" for the Press, and it has called forth another controversial sermon which has excited the public interest even more than the President's address. It would seem, then, that the time is again ripe for a reconsideration of the question in these columns.

Without reference to details, that the entire astronomical and geological universe has come into being through a process of evolution or gradual transformations continued throughout an enormous length of time, may safely be described as an axiom which no scientist or other thinking man would now deny. This much may be described as a definitely ascertained fact. But what the factors were that operated in the evolution is a question upon which there is still much speculation among experts, and about which finality in any sense has certainly not been reached. The heavens above and the earth beneath have yielded up their

secret to the extent of enabling us to postulate the general principle of evolution or descent by modification beyond any possibility of doubt, but the cause of the *modus operandi* is yet to seek. That man was part of this process is again an undeniable truth, for do we not find the actual relics of his animal ancestry in his body today? The vermiform appendix, the four imperfectly formed vertebrae or coccyx at the end of the backbone, representing the remains of a tail, the conical point sometimes seen on the margin of the ear-trumpet (*pinna*), corresponding to the tip of the pointed ear of rabbits, are but a few of the numerous vestigial organs (estimated at over a hundred) in the human body. They are quite inexplicable unless they are the remains of earlier structures, useful in a former mode of existence, like the two buttons on the back of the waist of a frock-coat, originally employed for fastening up the tails when riding horseback, or the shortened cassock or "apron" still worn by bishops, notwithstanding the replacement of the episcopal horse by the motor-car.

Similarly, the existence of a blood-relationship between ourselves and our nearest animal relatives is shown by the fact that when human blood is transfused into a dog, or even a monkey, the red corpuscles are destroyed, but when it is transfused into a chimpanzee there is an harmonious mingling of the two, as is also the case when the experiment is performed between a rabbit and a hare. This result is not obtained, however, when the blood of a rabbit is mixed with that of a dog or an anthropoid ape. By experiments of this nature the degree of relationship between man and the different main groups of apes can be determined, just as in the prenatal development of the embryo a similar evolution and relationship can be observed. Before a baby is born it passes through all the principal stages in the evolution of man from the unicellular organism or egg-cell, through the fish and reptile order, to that of the higher mammals. It is, however, only with the embryos of these species, and not with the actual animals, that a comparison is possible; the human embryo retaining an individuality of its own throughout the development.

Thus far, then, the mammalian origin of man may be regarded as definitely established; but beyond this we enter the realm of conjecture, where our guesses may be modified as the work of fitting the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle proceeds. For example, we cannot be certain when man emerged or exactly what course the emergence followed, though it is now becoming more and more evident that the event happened at a very remote period (much earlier than was hitherto supposed, probably in the Tertiary era), and that the evolution did not proceed in a

straight line. It would seem that a series of branchings from the parent stem took place in the Tertiary age which produced monkeys, apes, and finally tentative men. In this case, the anthropoids are our first cousins rather than our great-grandfathers; but, however this may be, man unquestionably is the finest example of an evolutionary emergence through a continuous and creative adaptation to the changing conditions of environment, the outcome of a persistent trend in cerebral development, which began before either monkeys or apes made their appearance.

Exactly what were the processes controlling this emergence it is very difficult to say. Darwin thought that natural selection sufficed to explain the cause of the *modus operandi* of evolution, and Sir Arthur Keith has recently maintained that man has been raised from a place amongst the anthropoids to that which he now occupies "under the action of biological forces, which can be observed and measured." It may be that the further study of the internal secretions of the thyroid and other endocrine or ductless glands, which are so important a feature in the bodies of at least the higher animals, will throw much light on the changes in the growth and activities of organisms. It also still remains to be investigated whether, as seems probable, there are analogous influences working through the lower animals and plants. But, whatever may be the outcome of modern physiological research in these matters, I venture to think that neither natural selection nor the action of biological forces will suffice to account for the whole process of evolution, and particularly for human consciousness. Can it really be maintained that life is merely a mechanical process, an automaton, the product of mechanically determined variations?

The Bishop of Birmingham, in a much-discussed sermon preached a short time ago at Westminster Abbey, asserted that while mind could not be regarded merely as a by-product of physico-chemical actions, yet once "life and mind emerged on the cooling of the earth as products of creative activity," evolution has proceeded in accordance with the Darwinian theory. But this hasty generalization would have been more acceptable in the nineteenth century than it is today. Thus Professor Leonard Hill, writing as a professional physiologist, replied: "That which appears to Dr. Barnes as absurd seems to me, however, as a physiologist, a rational and inevitable conclusion. The experimental observations and reasonings of the physicists and astronomers have indicated that matter is a manifestation of energy . . . which, transmutable and evolving in form, is indestructible and eternal. If, as I humbly apprehend, energy is the divine manifestation, then this divine manifestation is

evolving throughout the universe, and is in all, in the immense vastness of the stars and in the universe, and in the immense minuteness of the atoms, in all matter that we call dead as in all living substance."

This conclusion, of course, readily becomes pantheism, if the primary kinetic energy behind the universe be interpreted in terms of "spirit." But pantheism rests on the fallacy of abstraction, the universe being conceived abstractly as the expression of life. Actually life and mind are only known to us in Personality, and there we apprehend them concretely. The new physics has dispelled the mechanistic materialism of the last century, since it is no longer possible to regard the universe as an infinite machine of unique complexity. Behind the material entity, be it atom, proton, or electron, there is an "energy" revolving in the proton, upon which all phenomena depend. But this is not a blind force finding expression in natural selection and variation, for however determinative these factors may have been in the struggle for existence, they could not be really creative. As Canon Streeter has pointed out: "Natural selection no more brings into existence instincts or qualities which have a 'survival value' than a scholarship examination brings into existence clever and well-taught boys. It merely tests and selects the materials presented."

Organic evolution reveals the gradual emergence of higher and nobler forms of life, and it bears witness to the triumph of mind over matter, the emergence of individuality, personality, and an inner quality of life which in the human organism is rational and creative. The consciousness of personality and intelligence in man is something more than a mechanism working through a series of variations from an original mass of protoplasm sensitive to light. The composition of the human brain is undoubtedly mammalian in origin, the difference in structure between the two being one of complexity, form, and capacity, rather than in kind, in this sense. But the superiority in structure has enabled mental processes to operate in man as in no other organism, so that he has attained a degree of intelligence which is rational and creative, enabling him to make, guide, and control mechanisms as instruments of his mind. Moreover, he is capable of appreciating higher values, so that he places goodness above self-interest, and seeks after ethical ideals and spiritual achievements, thereby revealing that he is more than animal. He has a moral sense and a spiritual understanding unknown among the animal creation. Can it be that a blind, impersonal, unintelligent energy acting through colloidal matter is an adequate cause to produce creative and ethical intelligence? Surely this Cause must be a Mind transcending

all human aspiration and endeavour, an Ultimate Reality Who is the Divine Infinite Personality.

Viewed in this way evolution becomes simply God's method of creation, man himself reflecting more clearly the image of his Maker than any other creature. Thus all our new knowledge really leads us back to the position maintained in the opening chapters of the Bible. To suppose that these narratives represent in any sense historical descriptions of creation and the early history of mankind, in the face of the overwhelming and duly authenticated evidence to the contrary, is manifestly to be merely unintelligently obscurantist, and thereby to inflict grave injury on the cause of theology and religion. To say that scientists have not made up their minds concerning the modes of the origin of species—and the question is clearly one which can only be determined by scientific evidence—is simply untrue. Therefore to interpret the Genesis creation legends as though they were historical facts is to court disaster. But, on the other hand, it should be remembered that everything that scientists say is not science, and today the *causes* of the origin of species from the scientific point of view are more obscure than in the days of Darwin. That bishops should have a proper respect and reverence for the "great men" who engage in scientific research, and welcome new discoveries with an open mind, I should be the last person to deny! But those who engage in theological controversy will be well advised to make certain that they are not following blind leaders who will end by landing them in the ditch. Provisional hypotheses have an unhappy knack of appearing uncommonly like ascertained facts to the unwary, as, for example, in the case of the mythological theory of the Mystery Religion origin of the Sacraments. For a certain type of mind, "old dogmas" have a provocative effect, and such people readily seize upon any and every new thing and proclaim it as the death-knell of orthodoxy, only to discover that the old faith is really strengthened in the end by the additional knowledge, when it has been properly assimilated and adjusted.

Thus, in regard to evolution, it is rather childish in these days to talk of the relegation of Adam and Eve to the realms of folklore (where by now they must have quite settled in and become thoroughly at home) making it necessary to scrap Catholic and historic Christianity. In a measure it is true that the legends of the creation, primal innocence, and fall of our first parents were accepted as historically true by the men who built up Catholic theology, though never to the same extent as by the fathers of Protestantism. Thus Origen and St. Ambrose were content to interpret the stories allegorically,

St. Augustine regarded creation as a process of development by causal energy and potency, and although the Scholastics paid little attention to the subject, St. Thomas Aquinas, like Anselm before him, admitted a kind of allegorical treatment of the narratives, the former introducing Aristotelian ideas, and the latter reconciling the Genesis creation with Platonic philosophy. But at the Reformation the new insistence on the mechanical verbal inspiration of the Scriptures led Luther to assert that "Moses is writing history, and reporting things that actually happened," while Calvin similarly maintained that "God was pleased that a history of the creation should exist." It was under this influence of Protestant literalism that *Paradise Lost* was written, and the doctrine of special creation and the fixity of species became one of the chief tenets of post-Reformation theology. Therefore, really the theory is much more one of the heritages of doubtful value bequeathed to us by Protestantism than by the framers of Catholic doctrine. Whatever individuals may have thought, the Church at least has never officially defined the manner in which the Genesis narratives are to be interpreted.

The fact of evolution undoubtedly demands a restatement of the traditional theory of creation, and many priests would be well advised to bear this in mind in their instructions and sermons. Like Humpty-Dumpty, Adam and Eve have had a great fall from the wall of history, and no amount of theorizing about mythical "pre-Adamites" can put them together again and reinstate them in their former position. It is not calculated to edify or convince the properly informed about these matters, when important Christian doctrines are rested on the events recorded in the opening chapters of Genesis as though they were really historical facts. But making due allowance for the allegorical character of the stories, as *religious* rather than scientific statements they are not without their permanent value, revealing as they do creation as a theological concept—the emergence of all things according to the Will and Power of the Creator, and the interpretation of man's place in nature in relation to God.

SIN AND THE FALL.—Inasmuch as science does not deal with ultimate origins and values, the priestly writer of Gen. i.-ii. 4 supplies an eternal truth about creation, outside the scope of scientific definition, when he postulates, "in the beginning, God." Similarly, amid all the naïve anthropomorphisms of the earlier story (Gen. ii. 4-iii.) of the J document, there emerges the thought that man's disobedience to the higher light within him involves not only the death of the body, which is inevitable, but a death of the soul, or, in theological language, a falling away

from grace. Exactly how far the doctrine of the Fall and of original sin is implied in this cosmogony it is difficult to say. The belief in a personal and righteous God, and freewill in man, necessarily carries with it the notion of a "first sin," since a benevolent God could not create man inherently evil. But although we find plenty of references to human shortcomings in the Old Testament, hardly any attempt is made to account for their origin.

In Gen. iii. the initial act of disobedience is represented as bringing down upon the offenders an exterior punishment, but there is no suggestion that this included a bias towards evil in Adam's descendants. On the contrary, when the problem of sin was systematically investigated by the Jews after the Exile, human wickedness was explained in relation to the strange myth concerning the Nephilim in Gen. vi. 4. This is very apparent in the Book of Enoch and the apocalyptic literature generally, but although this view continued down to the Christian era as a popular belief, the official Rabbinical doctrine of Evil, as at the present day, was based on Gen. viii. 21 and vi. 5. But even as a popular theory the Nephilim were unsatisfactory, because they failed to explain the continuance of sin after the Flood. Gradually, therefore, another interpretation of the Fall arose based on the assumption that the original state of the first parents was one of unfallen righteousness, till their initial act of disobedience in the Garden brought sin and death into the world as the enduring heritage of the human race. It was this theory which St. Paul used to explain the doctrine of Redemption (Rom. v. 12 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 23), and under the influence of his language the early Christian writers often spoke of Adam's sin as affecting his descendants. But until St. Augustine systematized a theology of original sin in these terms in the West, the belief was not definitely formulated, and, as Dr. Williams has shown in his Bampton Lectures, the East has always treated the subject with a commendably "reverential vagueness." Moreover, even in the West, although the Church accepted the Augustinian attitude towards Pelagianism, it has never committed itself officially to his doctrine of original sin. In fact, it is not improbable, as Dr. Bicknell says, that the celebrated "Commonitorium" of Vincent of Lerins, in which "semper, ubique, ab omnibus" is laid down as the test of Catholicism, was aimed at the teaching of St. Augustine. It is therefore misleading to assume that "a horrible theory of the propagation of sin, reared on the basis of the Fall by Augustine, was accepted by official Catholic theologians," as though this was the specifically Catholic view as opposed to a more enlightened Protestant opinion. Actually the reverse is the case.

While the Church refrained from dogmatizing on the subject, the Protestant Reformers made an exaggerated Augustinianism the basis of their central doctrine of the Atonement. Both Luther and Calvin taught the depravity of human nature, some actually being predestined to evil and damnation. Therefore the worst extravagance of this "horrible theory" must be laid at the doors of Protestantism rather than at those of Catholicism.

Our Lord Himself makes no allusion to St. Paul's hypothesis, and He certainly did not represent human nature as inherently corrupt, though He maintained that man had fallen very far short of the original purpose of his creation, both as an individual and as a race. The seat of sin is in the will and not in matter. Therefore redemption necessitated the restoration of the will to a right relationship with God. If in the subconscious there are stored up the memories of our primeval experiences, as some psychologists surmise, it is possible that we start life with perverted instincts, but in any case we are inheritors of a social tradition that has gone wrong. In this fallen condition man could never fulfil his true vocation, and Christ, being the Image of God in human terms, revealed what man essentially is and what he may become. He started, as it were, a "new race," a regenerated humanity, to enable man to realize the purpose of his creation. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Therefore, while there may be a suggestion in the Adam-story of Gen. iii., and in the Watcher-legend of Gen. vi., that sin was at one time regarded as a Divine jealousy grudging man the acquisition of scientific knowledge—the "Prometheus-motif," as it has been called—there was also a deeper meaning in the allegorical eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Man as a moral being is conscious of an ethical distinction between right and wrong, and this entails moral responsibility. So our Lord represented our life here as a state of probation in which we may, if we will, move towards perfection as members of a redeemed race by accepting His offer of salvation. In short, Christ became "what we are, that He might make us what He is." Surely there is nothing in this restatement of the traditional dogma to conflict either with Catholic doctrine or scientific fact.

E. O. JAMES, D.LITT., F.S.A.

DEISM AND SACRAMENTAL BELIEF

THE Bishop of Birmingham has repeatedly explained that his rejection of the Catholic doctrine, that spiritual life is communicated in the Eucharist through the consecrated elements which in virtue of consecration have acquired new properties, is not merely due to critical difficulties or to biblical exposition. It is very largely indeed affected—one would venture to say, determined—by his speculative theories on the relation between spirit and matter. The exact nature of these theories has not been easy to determine, owing to the curiously naïve and unphilosophical way in which they have been presented; but it is now becoming increasingly clear that what we really have to do with is a position closely akin in many of its most characteristic principles to that of the eighteenth-century movement known as Deism.

The point has been well brought out in the Bishop of Manchester's recent comments upon one of Dr. Barnes' favourite clichés:

There are those who draw a distinction which I am wholly unable to draw—though that does not much matter—between organic and inorganic matter. While they are ready to believe in the power of the Holy Spirit over bodies which are organic to spiritual life, they are absolutely not prepared to regard the Holy Spirit's action as even possible on material things which are not in that way organic to spiritual life, but which are none the less deeply significant for spiritual beings. As I say, that is a distinction which I cannot follow. But it is said—at any rate it is sometimes said—that “you cannot endow dead matter with spiritual qualities.” I wish to say that that statement is irrelevant so far as it is true, and untrue so far as it is relevant. It is true in the sense that nothing can make a piece of dead matter into a piece of living matter. Nothing can make it, in technical language, a centre of consciousness except the creative act of God Himself, and thus no one supposes that the consecrated Bread of the Eucharist becomes in that kind of way, so to speak, alive. That is not in question. On the other side, if it is meant that dead matter cannot be the vehicle of spiritual meaning and power, that is what I wish expressly to deny. That which is not in itself life can take on a spiritual meaning for life.*

This is illustrated by ideas conveyed through musical sounds.

If I rightly understand Dr. Barnes, I think that he would admit that material things can become vehicles of spiritual meaning; they may represent and be symbolical of religious ideas. But what he rejects is the doctrine that material things can convey religious power, vitality, or strength. In other words,

* *A Plea for the New Prayer Book*, by the Bishop of Manchester, pp. 22, 23.

the elements are in his opinion distinctly symbolical, but they are nothing else. They suggest thoughts, but they impart no power. This is what I imagine he means by constantly reiterating the statement that you cannot endow dead matter with spiritual qualities.

But this proposition depends for its value on a Deistic conception of the relation of God to the material universe. It suggests the idea of a Deity outside the world, an extra-mundane Being who, because He is spiritual, is of necessity aloof from the material. Deity seems conceived as dwelling apart from the material universe, which, although He utilizes it from without for the purpose of conveying signals to humanity, He certainly does not pervade. Thus the whole stress seems laid on the divine transcendence to the virtual exclusion of the divine immanence. But to do this is to ignore the deeper and truer Theistic conception, which St. Paul accepted when he endorsed the statement that "in Him we live and move and have our being." God, according to Theism, is not excluded from the world. Rather He comprehends the world within Himself. As Christians we must certainly rid our minds of any Gnostic or Manichæan antagonism between matter and spirit, or the theory that real and intimate contact between Deity and the material world is impossible. According to Christianity, the ultimate reality is not matter, but spirit, and matter is dependent for its very existence upon spirit. Matter, according to Christian thought, exists simply through the presence within it of the divine sustaining power. If God withdrew from the material universe it would simply disappear. Now this close, intimate and indispensable relation of God to matter appears to neutralize or render meaningless the notion that matter cannot be endowed with spiritual qualities. Matter cannot be impervious to spirit, for by spirit its existence is maintained. If divine immanence is as true as divine transcendence, both alike being essential to the Christian conception of Deity, it is impossible to place limits to the power of God in heightening the capacities of material things and utilizing them for the highest purposes. No pronouncement against this possibility on scientific grounds can possess the slightest theological validity, because such pronouncement is entirely beyond the province of science.

In his sermon on Sacramental Truth and Falsehood, at Birmingham, October 6, 1927, Dr. Barnes* contended that "it is fatally easy to pass from the idea that Sacraments serve to reveal God, to a belief that through them we can mechanically bring God to men or cause Him to locate Himself in some object

* *The Times*, October 7, 1927.

or place. Such a belief belongs to the realm of primitive magic."

This statement, unintentionally of course, misrepresents the doctrine which it condemns, because it lays the whole stress on the action of men, and says nothing whatever of the power and will of God. To say that we can mechanically bring God to man or cause Him to locate Himself in some object or place, is not a true representation of the Catholic belief. No instructed Catholic would express the doctrine in such terms. The Catholic belief is that God can not only reveal Himself through signs, but can through those signs bring Himself to men. How different the doctrine seems when stated thus! Neither is it at all mechanical: it is the act of God. Neither does this Catholic belief belong to the region of primitive magic. It is not a human device to bring compulsion to bear on Deity, but a divinely constructed method to bring Deity within the reach of men.

The truth is that the Catholic doctrine which maintains that the presence of Christ is identified with the material elements in the Eucharist must not be isolated from the whole system of great religious conceptions to which it belongs. At the foundation of these conceptions is the Theistic doctrine that the whole material universe is pervaded by the Divine. On the basis of that Theistic doctrine rests the sublime belief that Deity can come, and has actually come, into a far more intimate and wonderful union with matter in the Incarnation. There the constitution of man became actually united with the real personal presence of Deity. Now it is obvious that on the basis of these two doctrines (I mean first the Theistic doctrine that matter is sustained by the power of the Deity, and secondly that matter is in the Incarnation personally indwelt and taken possession of by Deity), the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in connection with the Eucharistic elements becomes a different thing, and vastly more intelligible, because it ceases to be an isolated peculiarity. It is seen to be part of a great universal relation between the spiritual and the material. Of course, this intelligibility of the sacramental presence is only open to those who accept the principles of Theism and the principles of the Incarnation. And this fact suggests the suspicion that the reason why the presence in the Eucharistic Elements is discredited is because those who discredit it either are not really Theists and do not believe in the real Deity of Christ, or do not realize the implications of their own accepted beliefs, and therefore are naturally disinclined to believe in the real presence in the sacramental elements. The doctrine of Grace imparted through consecrated elements is part of one great systematic

conception of the relation between God and creation. Therefore, before men criticize the Eucharistic presence, the first thing to decide is whether they are Theists, and the second whether they believe what historic Christianity has understood by the Incarnation, and thirdly, if so, how far they realize its implications. It can be no surprise, for example, that in Germany, where a purely humanitarian unitarian conception of Jesus is substituted for the Catholic conception of the Incarnation, the Catholic doctrine of the real presence in the consecrated elements is rejected. Given these presuppositions nothing could be more natural. It is exactly what ought to be expected. But the rejection is due to their un-Theistic and un-Apostolic presuppositions.

The Bishop, however, went further. He proposed to subject the Catholic belief to a scientific test, as follows:

For the belief that inanimate matter can be endowed with spiritual qualities there is no scientific evidence. The contention can be tested by the usual scientific procedure of experiment and observation. A Catholic praying before a wafer which he wrongly believed to have been consecrated would gain precisely the same spiritual satisfaction as if his belief were true.

There are among ourselves today men and women whose sacramental beliefs are not far from those of the cultured Hindu idolater. They pretend that a priest using the right words and acts can change a piece of bread so that within it there is the real presence of Christ. The idea is absurd, and can be disproved by experiment. If there were a physical change in the bread, chemical analysis would enable us to detect it. All are agreed that this type of change does not take place, yet if there be a spiritual change it must surely be possible for man to recognize it by his spiritual perception. Now I assume—and who will gainsay me?—that there is no man living who, if a piece of bread were presented to him, could say whether or not it had been consecrated. Personally I find it hard to attach any meaning to a spiritual change in dead matter, but if it exists there must surely be some living person who can perceive its existence. If there be no such person, belief in such a change is an idle superstition.*

Is not that a singularly double-edged, and therefore dangerous argument to use in the interests of religion? It is clearly not an argument applicable to nothing beside the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament. It can be applied, it is actually applied, to the whole range of religious experience. It is precisely the criticism which the rationalist makes about prayer before an unseen Deity. The rationalist argues that if a man is persuaded that God exists, and therefore prays to Him, he gains precisely the same spiritual satisfaction as if his belief were true. Accordingly, there is no need in religion to pos-

* *The Times*, October 7, 1927.

tulate objective realities, since subjective illusion works just as well.

This is precisely the danger to which the student of psychology is liable. He is concerned with subjective feelings and emotions and beliefs. But the problem what objective reality corresponds to these subjective feelings is exactly what as a psychologist he is unable to decide. The more he dwells on self-suggestion, the more he explains religious experience within the realm of subjectivity. The transition from subjective feeling to objective reality is for the psychologist beyond his province. The argument, therefore, is very dangerous because it insists on religious illusions without attempting to determine the assurance of objective realities.

Now the Bishop of Birmingham has assured us that he believes that our Lord is actually present in the Sacrament, although that presence is not connected with the consecrated elements. The question, therefore, is, What answer would he give to a rationalist who asserts that the Bishop can give no scientific proof that Christ is really there? The rationalist will say that the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is no doubt the Bishop's subjective belief: but that subjective belief is no guarantee of correspondence with objective reality; and that through this subjective belief the Bishop gains precisely the same spiritual satisfaction whether Christ is there or not—in fact, whether Christ exists or not.

One would be very interested to know—because it is imperatively urgent beyond expression—how the Bishop proposes to prove scientifically that his personal subjective experience corresponds with objective realities. Will it not be truly said that his belief in Christ's presence in the Sacrament, but not in the elements, is a purely personal, individual experience, in its very nature absolutely incommunicable, and is entirely outside the reach and range of science?

When the criticism of the rationalizing psychologist has been answered, it will assuredly be seen that the answer deprives of any force the Bishop's criticism about the subjective feelings of the worshipper in the presence of a wafer which he mistakenly believes to be consecrated. The fact is that devotion is not only to be viewed on the side of man: it must be also viewed on the side of God. It takes two to make a prayer: one who hears as well as one who speaks. And the Deity Who hears presumably makes response. Suppose, then, the case of a believer who prays before a wafer which is not consecrated. The prayer is not directed to the material element, but to the Divine Being Whose presence the wafer is supposed to indicate. Does anyone suppose the Holy One makes no response owing

to the mistaken belief of the man who prays? Whether the wafer is consecrated or not, if in both cases under the impression that it is consecrated the same spiritual satisfaction is derived, who can venture to say that this result is not in both cases equally created by the Divine Being to Whom the appeal of faith was made? In this realm of sacramental experience we are not dealing with mere mechanism, but with will, and love, and goodness, and Deity. The argument, therefore, from identity of subjective effect provided by a consecrated and an unconsecrated wafer is no more convincing than the same argument applied to the case of worship whether God exists or does not.

As to the proposed scientific analysis of a consecrated wafer, it is really a transference of methods appropriate to one department of experience to another where they do not apply.

In the singularly illuminating and remarkable article contributed by Professor Taylor and Mr. Spens to the Anglo-Catholic Congress,* a physical object is defined as "a complex of opportunities of experience." Such object has natural properties and properties as an effectual symbol. When the effectual symbolism is determined by men it is clear that the former has a fixity which does not belong to the latter. But when the effectual symbolism of an object is determined by the Divine Will it has the same basis as its natural properties possess. "If our Lord meant men to regard His Death on the Cross as an effectual, and the one effectual, immolation, the words 'This is My Body' and 'This is My Blood' must be held to mean that, receiving the broken bread and the cup which has been blessed, we are made partakers in the blessings of that sacrifice. The words employed suggest also participation in the very life of Christ, and this is in any case involved in our participation in the blessings of the sacrifice."†

The opportunity for the participation in the life of Christ is afforded by the objects or elements. "If the symbolism is effectual, if we have no mere tokens but a Sacrament; and if, in consequence, the consecrated bread and wine afford real spiritual opportunities, then these opportunities have the same basis as the opportunities of physical experience—namely, the Divine Will." There is no ground for treating the opportunities of physical experience as more fundamental. "Host or Chalice is a complex of opportunities of experience, some physical but some spiritual, all equally determined by the Divine Will and all associated by that Will. Accuracy of thought requires us to recognize, in consequence, that, in each case, these opportunities constitute a single object." If it is difficult for us to appreciate this, it is because we are inclined to think the material

* Anglo-Catholic Congress Report, p. 112.

† *Ibid.*, p. 113.

more real than the spiritual. "Before consecration the Host has certain opportunities of physical experience. After consecration it is changed, not by any change in the opportunities of experience which previously constituted the object, not by any change in anything which can be correlated in terms of electrons, but by the addition of opportunities of spiritual experience in that, by devout communion, we are made partakers in Christ. We are guilty of gross materialism if we think of the Host, or Chalice, in terms only of their physical properties, as purely physical objects, rather than in terms also of the opportunities of spiritual experience they afford, opportunities which are no less fundamental, and which are infinitely more significant."*

We say, then, that the bread and wine by consecration acquire a new property. Their devout reception secures participation in the life of Christ. But who can presume to say that our spiritual perception must needs enable us to detect apart from the use of them whether the elements before us have acquired this property or not? Human inability to detect a spiritual change is no proof whatever that there is no change. For spiritual things may well transcend our very limited perception.

But when we confess our own narrow limitations, we can well be prepared to rest on the ordinance of Jesus Christ. We may believe that He was able to invest material things which He had consecrated with a capacity which in the things themselves we confess ourselves unable to discover by any normal process of scientific measurement or analysis.

If we are to appreciate the Bishop's sacramental instructions accurately, it is best to have his latest utterances before our minds, especially since these latest utterances constitute his official explanation of his position to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In his second letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury his teaching is that (1) "the real presence of Christ can be with His followers in public worship. He is present wherever two or three are gathered in His name. (2) A special solemnity attaches to the celebration of the Lord's Supper, inasmuch as for most Christians the sense of Christ's presence is then strengthened. For such it is a Sacrament, the 'fellowship meal,' the communion 'with each other and the Lord.' (3) There is no *objective* real presence of Christ attached to the bread and wine used in Holy Communion."†

Elsewhere in the same letter it is said that "spiritual grace is given, not to the elements which are its vehicles in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, but to the worshipper who takes, eats, and drinks as he comes with faith and prayer and love to Christ."

* Anglo-Catholic Congress Report, p. 114.

† *Ibid.*

He assures us that the disciples at the Institution could not have believed that the bread became Christ's Body. He adds that Christ's giving of Himself was spiritual. And "the breaking of the bread was the symbol of the breaking of His Body on the Cross, the symbol of Christ's gift of His own life that His Spirit, through the agency of those whom He inspired, might redeem the world."

These examples of the Bishop's teaching are typical. His published utterances are much plainer in their rejections than in their acceptances. This is curiously characteristic of the Bishop's mind. He is immeasurably more critical than constructive. He has directed much energy to the repudiation of the doctrine that consecration effects any relation between the Sign and the Thing Signified. But there is not anything like a corresponding energy of positive affirmation.

So far as I know there has been no instruction given on the doctrine of Grace, which, after all, lies at the basis of the sacramental principle.

What, then, should we mean by Grace? Consider what human nature needs. The natural man is invariably hindered by two principal defects: the one is ignorance, the other is weakness. In the first place, we do not know; in the second place, when we know we fail to achieve. This is the universal condition of human nature while left to itself. This is the well-known confession of pagans and converts alike. Clearly, therefore, if a religion is to supply the requirements of the natural man, it must provide him not only with knowledge, but also with power. Now this is exactly what the religion of the Incarnation does. Christ is not only the Revelation of spiritual ideas; He is also the giver of strength.

In biblical theology the technical expression "grace" means primarily divine benevolence; but it is a comprehensive term which includes divine benevolent deeds, and the imparting of supernatural gifts. Grace is incomparably more than imparting ideas to the human mind. It is not something purely intellectual. It is power imparted to the believer's entire personality. It is the infusion of supernatural strength. "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do" (Phil. ii. 13). As Augustine says: "We therefore work, but God works within us in our working." He does not only bring the influence of His personality to bear upon ours in the conscious department of our being by way of suggestion or revelation of religious principles. But there is an actual imparting of His own divine vitality and power, a co-operation of His strength with our weakness, whether we are aware of it or not.

It would be really helpful to know whether this kind of

statement represents the Bishop's teaching. What makes it peculiarly advisable that some explicit statement on the doctrine of Grace should be given is that the Bishop has insisted more strongly on the need of subjective preparation for the Sacrament than on the nature of the objective Gift received, and has also questioned the desirableness of reception of the Sacrament every Sunday, and has further recommended Mattins as the ordinary and habitual devotion for Christian people rather than the Eucharist.

There is one particular argument which the Bishop urges against the Catholic belief in consecration of the elements which, however plausible at first sight, fails to represent the case fully and fairly. It is the argument that, since the Apostles saw the Lord bodily present before them at the Institution, they could not have imagined Him to mean that the bread became His Body. The weakness of this argument lies in its assumption that the Apostles' capacity to apprehend Christ's meaning then and there, in the Upper Room before His Passion, is the measure of the limit of what is true. Now nobody would dream of asserting this with regard to Apostolic apprehension of any of the other fundamental doctrines distinctive of the Christian religion. Why should a single exception be made in the case of the doctrine of the Sacraments? The Bishop's argument is in reality a dangerous example of special pleading in favour of a view concerning which his mind was already decided on philosophic or scientific grounds.

While we really do not know, and cannot know, exactly what impression our Lord's words made upon the Twelve at the Institution of the Sacrament, what we do know is that our Lord said of the bread, "This is My Body," and of the wine, "This is My Blood"; and that St. Paul, who almost certainly drew his information about the Sacrament from the same Apostolic source from which he drew his information about Christ's Resurrection, taught that "the Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of (or participation in) the Blood of Christ?" There is no reason to suppose that any of the original Twelve would have contradicted him or taught otherwise. Why should we not believe that he was guided to a true conclusion?

W. J. SPARROW-SIMPSON.

THE WORLD INTO WHICH CHRISTIANITY CAME: THE ROMAN EMPIRE*

It was in the fullness of time, as St. Paul says, that God sent forth His Son—*i.e.*, the Incarnation was the divine event for which all previous ages had been preparing. On any view, the birth of our Lord could not have taken place under conditions more favourable for the spread of the new religion. Christ was born under the first of the Roman Emperors and crucified under the second; and when the time came for His Gospel to be preached throughout the world, the Empire was already a centralized unity. The apologist Melito, who wrote under Marcus Aurelius (161-180), claimed, on the strength of this synchronism, that the Empire was divinely intended to help the Church. And this purpose it did in fact perform, the policy of many of its rulers notwithstanding. For it was only by the excellent organization of the Roman Empire that the world-wide dissemination of the Gospel, humanly speaking, was made possible; and this organization itself was a new thing, which came at exactly the right moment in history to render service to the new religion.

The Empire included practically the whole civilized world as it was then known. Its great central block consisted of the lands washed by the Mediterranean Sea, but extended far beyond these: to the Euphrates in the east, to the Rhine and Danube in the north, while west and north-west it took in Spain, France, and England—to use the modern names; south and south-east not only a large strip of Northern Africa, but Egypt also. The welding together of this vast area by the genius of Rome gave rise to a new commercial activity; and this involved a more extensive use of all trade routes, whether roads or waterways. The record of St. Paul's missionary journeys is an eloquent commentary on the safety and rapidity of travel along the great Roman roads, and the high degree of law and order which flourished under the Pax Romana. Hence Christians were very greatly helped in their task of spreading their religion, especially as ideas travelled more quickly than anything else, and were more eagerly interchanged. Thus the new faith would gradually attract the attention of the pagan world, and individual Christians, as they journeyed, could fall in with fellow-Christians, and form increasingly large groups in various places.

The Church in Rome provides a conspicuous example of

* A lecture delivered at the Vacation Term for Biblical Study held at Cambridge in August, 1927.

this process at work. Rome was the centre and pivot of all the ceaseless traffic of the Empire; it was also the goal of all the ambitious and adventurous spirits from the cities of Greece and Asia Minor and yet more remote portions of the Roman world. Juvenal complains that in his day the Syrian river Orontes had flowed into the Tiber; and the salutations of Rom. xvi. indicate pretty clearly that Christians took their share in the influx. The most probable account of the origin of the Christian community at Rome is that which ascribes it to these movements. Individual Christians would gravitate thither, and thus become acquainted with one another and form a definite group. When once the group existed—even before it was formally constituted a church by apostolic authority—it would not only gain fresh adherents from the continuous stream of immigrants, but also diffuse its influence over other parts of the Empire by means of those who were journeying outwards from the capital. This seems to have been one of the ways in which the unique political position of Rome resulted automatically in the unique importance and influence of its Church; though the same process, on a smaller scale, was taking place in all the important towns of the empire.

Besides all the material means employed by Augustus for the unification of the Empire, there was also one remarkable piece of State policy by which he aimed at enlisting the power of religion in the same cause. This was the institution known as *Cæsar-worship*. Tolerant though the ancient world was in the matter of gods and creeds, Augustus knew that divisions between peoples were most bitter and unity most strong, when based upon religious sanctions. So he set himself to forge a religious bond of union for the Empire, and in large measure he succeeded. He did not provide a universal spiritual religion, the need for which could only be met by Christianity; but he did provide a new universal cult which went far to bind the various provinces to Rome and to one another.

The heathen gods had not come very creditably out of the world struggle which preceded the Empire; least of all in the provinces, where they had already lost prestige by their obvious inability to resist the Roman yoke. Moreover, whereas in the days of Senatorial rule the provinces had been mercilessly bled by unscrupulous governors, the Empire now brought them justice and prosperity; the desolations of many generations began to fade at last from sight and memory. These benefits were so great and so tangible that there arose spontaneously a widespread impulse to regard the ruler of Rome as divine. The feeling was real enough in Italy; it was more vivid still in the provinces. Augustus found it existing when he began his work

of imperial organization, and turned it to practical use by making it a cardinal point in his new provincial system.

The system itself was a form of home rule. Cities connected with one another by ties of religion or kindred or both were formed into groups; and once a year the different groups of each province met together in a sort of Provincial Parliament (*κοινόν*). It was on the new ritual of Cæsar-worship that Augustus relied for the bond which should hold together the various groups contained in each provincial area. He used it to supply the religious ceremonies without which no *κοινόν* would ever meet; and he made it into a cult of Rome and Augustus—the imperial city and the imperial ruler—rather than an individual honour paid to himself. Thus he put it on a comparatively high level, and enabled it to survive his own death unshaken. By that time the cult was widespread in the Eastern provinces and rapidly growing in the Western; and in a short time Cæsar-worship became, in fact if not in name, the official and established religion of the Roman State, because it was so easily capable of universal adoption throughout the Empire.

For the Christian Church the main results of this process were two: (1) Men's minds became accustomed to the idea of a universal religion, however superficial, and to this extent the way was made ready for the propagation of Christianity. But (2) Polytheism cannot be exclusive, and religious toleration, or rather inclusiveness, was part of the imperial policy. One god more or less made very little difference to pagan peoples, and participation in Cæsar-worship was naturally asked for and willingly given as a sign of loyalty to Rome and the Emperor. But the Christian was put into a most difficult position; he could not comply with the demand, except at the cost of apostasy; nor could he refuse compliance without being regarded by his fellow-citizens as a traitor and "atheist"; while if he shunned social festivities altogether, he was quickly diagnosed as a hater of the human race. These were the conditions which led to two of the most savage anti-Christian outbreaks of the second century—at Smyrna in 155, and at Lyons in 177.

We must glance now at the old religion, the official religion of the Roman Empire, for repudiation of which the Christians were regarded as "atheists." It need not be a long glance, for Roman religion was not a spiritual power when Christianity came into the world, and it exerted no influence on Christian thought. At its best, it was morality untinged with emotion; at its worst it was gloomy and superstitious. At its best it was the religion of men who put duty first and sentiment nowhere. Each part of social duty, each undertaking of daily

life, had its own presiding deity; this pleased the orderly Roman mind, even if it did not stimulate devotion. The gods of the most real and practical importance were the Lares and Penates, homely deities who presided over the household. Caesar-worship, to a certain extent, presented the same conception, in a diffused and idealized and consequently vaguer, form as the cult of the presiding divinity of the whole Empire. Long before this, again, Greek influences had crept in and Greek gods with them, but without greatly modifying the existing religion.

The great weakness of pagan religion in general was that it had no God. For where many so-called gods are acknowledged, no God is truly worshipped. Stoicism did indeed attempt to conserve both the deities of traditional orthodoxy and the single overruling divinity required by the philosophical craving for unity; this divinity was the world-soul, and the result would have been Pantheism but for the identification of this world-soul, as in Varro, with Jupiter Capitolinus. "But it is only as the source of legalized morality," writes Dr. Warde Fowler, "that we can think of Varro's Jupiter as 'making for righteousness.'" Nor did Roman religious thought as a whole teach so high a theological level.

Paganism, again, lacked a Church. There was no definite creed, no definite system of instruction, no preaching, no pastoral care. Priesthood was not a holy vocation, but a common stepping-stone to social influence and official promotion; the priests were not prophets or pastors or teachers, but aldermen. Julian's attempt to establish a pagan Church on Catholic lines broke down largely because of this fundamental fact, which he had entirely failed to grasp. Finally, the hope of immortality, though it appears now and again, had no fixed place in the religion of the ordinary Roman. Cicero reached it, in the strong emotion caused by the death of his daughter, but he justified it to himself from Plato, not from the sanctions of Roman official religion. And the underworld revealed to us by Virgil in the sixth book of the "*Æneid*," though wonderfully described, is as devoid of consolation and good hope as its Homeric prototype. The brighter expectations brought to men's minds by the consolidation of the Empire under Augustus, and reflected in the famous "Messianic" eclogue of Virgil, were concerned with life in this world rather than with that of a world to come.

From religion we pass for a moment to education. Here the fundamental institution, from the second century onwards, was the grammar school. These public institutions replaced such private academies as that in which Horace and other farmers' sons learned little and suffered much under the

plagosus Orbilius and suchlike pedagogues. Grammar schools existed to teach grammar, but the word "grammar" had a wide significance, and connoted a broad literary education. This was open to all who cared to profit by it; while for those who had the necessary leisure and means a university education was available at Athens or Alexandria or Rome, or, from the fourth century onwards, Constantinople.

The grammar-school system was excellent as far as it went, and schools flourished and abounded throughout the Empire. Thus another bond of imperial unity was forged. But there were at least two serious defects in the *substance* of the curriculum.

1. Latin was not taught in the Eastern schools, while in the Western schools Greek, though nominally part of the syllabus, does not seem to have been welcomed by the pupils. This defect was largely responsible for subsequent misunderstandings between Eastern and Western theologians, and so of much unnecessary disturbance of the peace of the Church. And St. Augustine's well-known mistranslation of the crucial phrase $\epsilon\phi' \omega$ in Rom. v. 12 had momentous consequences.

2. But the second defect was still more serious, and was inherent in the curriculum as a whole. For the aim of the grammar school was to make rhetoricians; and the school of rhetoric was the next sojourning place of the more competent scholars. In this pursuit accuracy, morality, and every other consideration ranked below the æsthetic and emotional effect, with the result that the Roman schools, in Dr. Biggs' words, were "much fitter to produce amateur actors than efficient servants of the State." Artificiality and bad taste were fostered, while history was neglected except as a storehouse of themes for declamation. The Church reacted strongly against these evils, but not without being partially affected by them herself. Even so great and creative a mind as Origen's shows the taint; if humble and homely objects are mentioned in Scripture, there must be, he thinks, some hidden and profound spiritual meaning to be extracted from such passages; the dignity of the divine revelation seemed to him to require some such canon of interpretation. So long did it take even the doctrine of the Incarnation to instil into its adherents a true sense of the value of ordinary human things.

A word must be said about the moral condition of the Empire. On so wide a field it is never safe to generalize, and satirists like Juvenal must be read with caution. No doubt the vices which he castigates were real and vile, but moralists who attack the sins of society are not concerned to draw attention to its virtues, and the picture they give us is one-sided. Yet it

is quite plain that one great appeal made by the Christian faith to the best pagan minds lay in its pure and high morality; and incidental allusions in the apologists, where there is no directly polemical intent, indicate clearly enough the dark features of the moral background of the time. The morality which we have discussed in Roman religion at its best was a morality of public duty, not of individual goodness; it instilled civic rather than private virtues. No one could turn to the inhabitants of Olympus for examples of pureness of living.

It will suffice here to draw attention to three great moral wrongs which tainted the whole life of the Empire in early Christian times. The first is slavery. It is true that many slaves were well and even kindly treated, and men of servile origin rose to high position in the State. But they had no moral code outside the one rule of obedience to their master; they were still the mere "living tools" of which Aristotle had spoken; they were not allowed to have a conscience of their own or to draw distinctions between right and wrong. And the most trifling annoyance caused by a slave to his master resulted easily in crucifixion. Thus the whole status of the slave was a direct denial of the doctrines of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The second great moral wrong was the practice of infanticide. This was very common, and so fully sanctioned by long-standing ideas of a father's rights and privileges, that even Constantine refrained from legislating against it. Unwanted children were exposed as soon as they were born. They did not necessarily perish; often they were saved by industrious pimps who speculated in baby rearing, and brought up these foundlings to become slaves and prostitutes. "But as for us," writes St. Justin in his first Apology, "we have been taught that to expose children is the part of wicked men; and this we have been taught lest we should do anyone an injury, and lest we should sin against God, first, because we see that almost all so exposed (not only the girls, but also the males) are brought up to prostitution. And as the ancients are said to have reared herds of oxen, or goats, or sheep, or grazing horses, so now we see you rear children only for this shameful use!"

The third great moral wrong belongs to the sphere of public amusements. I refer to the gladiatorial shows in the arena. Quite apart from the colossal waste of money involved in these shows, they gave every possible encouragement to all that was worst in human nature: cruelty, blood lust, and moral insensibility. Constantine forbade them, but in vain. Trajan, most enlightened of pagan Emperors, contributed 10,000 prisoners of war to the arena in celebration of his Dacian triumph. The

real goodness of the Emperor and the vastness of the number thus condemned is an eloquent commentary both on the scale of this brutal amusement and the demoralization which it caused. There is a vivid picture in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine (vi. 8) of the horrible fascination exerted by it even on an unwilling spectator of high personal integrity. Alypius was taken forcibly on one occasion to the amphitheatre by some companions; he went protesting that though his body might be compelled, nothing would induce his soul and his eyes to take any share in the spectacle. But a great shout which arose when one of the gladiators fell aroused his curiosity and he opened his eyes. What followed may be described in St. Augustine's words: "When he saw the blood, he at once imbibed a savage spirit, and did not turn away his head, but remained with fixed eyes, drinking in unconsciously violent passions, and, charmed with the wicked conflict, became intoxicated with the bloody spectacle. And he was no longer the man who had joined the assembly, but one of those he had joined, and a true companion of those who had brought him to the place. What more shall I say? He gazed, he shouted, he grew hot, he carried away with him such an infatuation as should goad him to return, not only with the same companions, but even before they arrived, yes, and to entice others also."

ERIC GRAHAM.

ST. PAUL AMONG THE JEWS*

A NEW DRAMA (II)

MOUNT CALVARY is the spot upon which the fourth scene opens. Against the night sky the hilltop is faintly outlined, showing mounds and decaying crosses. Chanan, the High Priest's elder son, is there with some Zealots. He is giving them their instructions concerning the rebellion which is afoot. Pinchas arrives breathless, bringing the news that their plans are all discovered by Marullus, and therefore urges them to flight, but he is taken away as a traitor, while Chanan and his Zealots march off.

Simon Peter, James, and Barnabas now enter, the latter carrying a lantern. Peter and James are talking of Paul and his teaching "that sin is the fruit of the Law," which has brought such disquiet among the Christians. While they talk thus, Barnabas has been looking round among the mounds

* One of the Boys' Lectures on "St. Paul in Jewish Thought," delivered in September at the Church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff.

and crosses. He now asks them: "Pray tell me which is *the* Cross?" And to his amazement and sorrow, no less than their own, they cannot tell him; Peter stretching out his arms to heaven: "Pardon us, Lord! . . . How could we have *known* that the ignominious wood of the Cross is the Throne of Thy Kingdom!"

Barnabas: By the two beams in which God and man meet, by the Cross which ye understood not, let us stand by Brother Paul.

(He puts out the light and they all three melt into the darkness.)

Now the Rabbis Zaddok, Huna, Meir, and the Rabbi Exorcist appear, with their disciples carrying lighted torches. They have come to exorcise the evil spirit in Paul. He is presently brought in and tied to a stake.

Paul: What is the meaning of this jest?

Rabbi Meir: The fathers are endeavouring to save thee.

Paul (quietly): I am saved.

They turn on him in anger at this. In vain does Paul try to explain to them his new position. "Am I guilty because Truth has taken its abode in me?" Rabbi Meir wishes to give Paul yet another chance. "It is not good," he says, "that Jew should rage against Jew." Paul continues to say he is perfectly well and sane, and that the *Christ* speaks in him.

Suddenly he recognizes Calvary. "Men, this wood lives! Here the lightning cleft the world, which yet remains so undisturbed. Men go on in the selfsame way, and no one, no one is amazed!"

At this the Exorcist prepares to work his charms. But suddenly Paul stops him, and, fixing him with his gaze, makes him helpless. The Exorcist falls impotent before this mightier exorcist, Paul. Seeing which, there is great consternation. Paul, in the power of Christ's love, looses him from his thralldom, and the poor wretch staggers away. The Rabbis' disciples are enraged and would fall upon Paul, when something unexpected startles and fills them with fear, for in the distance martial strains are heard. Rabbi Shimon, the son of Gamaliel, comes upon the scene, all pale and disordered, and stammers out the frightful news that the city is in an uproar, the Zealots are fighting the Roman soldiers in the streets, and Caesar's eagle has been pulled down and trampled upon. "The Temple! The Temple!" laments Rabbi Zaddok.

Barnabas now begs Paul to take advantage of the confusion to make his escape. But he will not. Into the midst of it comes Marullus with soldiers. With his usual scornful courtesy, he mocks the Rabbis. In the light of the flickering torches

he proceeds to harangue them on their ungratefulness to him, who has ever treated them and all things Jewish with such respect and consideration. He wilfully puts upon them the onus of this Zealot rebellion, and will not listen to their protestations of innocence. "Old men who are innocent usually are asleep before sunrise," says he. The Rabbis turn on Paul and blame him for all their troubles. Frisius enters to tell Marullus that the rebellion has been quenched, and through the influence of Gamaliel, for the Roman soldiers were practically overcome by the enemy. Marullus is nonplussed, but after a moment's thought whispers:

"This incident . . . must not, of course, be reported to Rome." To the Rabbis he makes out that the soldiers have restored peace, but with the loss of five men, while in truth only one Roman soldier has been hurt. Unfortunately, he states, punishment must be meted out to the instigators of this revolt. He tells the Rabbis to name them. They protest their ignorance, but Marullus vows he knows the leader already.

The Rabbis : Who ?

Marullus : Saul of Tarsus.

The Rabbis' joy knows no bounds at the turn things have taken.

Barnabas (to Paul) : Now, may Christ protect thee !

(Paul is pushed forward, the soldiers hold the torches to his face. Day breaks. While Marullus is questioning Paul, Gamaliel suddenly appears.)

Gamaliel : Who is guilty here ?

Marullus (uncomfortably moved, shaking himself; then politely) : Most honoured patriarch ! Rome is eternally indebted to thee, most worthy one !

Gamaliel : I do nothing for Rome, Roman !

Marullus : What stoic modesty ! Can I serve thee ?

Gamaliel : Who was proclaimed guilty here ?

Marullus : Thou acknowledgest that Rome cannot let this night pass unpunished !

Gamaliel : Rome will receive her compensation. For this I can pledge myself, Roman ! Who is accused ?

Marullus : He, there ! Thy colleagues also accuse him.

Gamaliel : Hast thou proofs ?

Marullus : This letter !

Gamaliel (takes the letter and slowly tears it to pieces) : Are calumniation proofs for Rome ?

Marullus (annoyed) : Am I now the defendant or the Procurator ?

Gamaliel : Thou art now a man with a man's responsibility !

(The daylight increases.)

Gamaliel (to Paul) : Is it not so, my child, we have something to settle between Israel and Israel ?

Paul : Between Israel and Israel ! Rabboni !

Gamaliel: And it is more important than all the kingdoms of the world!

Paul: Mightier than the kingdom of this world, Rabboni!

Gamaliel: And if in this place guilt is to be expiated, both of us should bring down peace!

Paul (with a stifled joy in his voice): I have a message of peace for thee, my teacher. And thou wilt hear it!

Gamaliel (to the Rabbis): Turn aside! . . . and thou follow me!

(The Rabbis protest at Gamaliel's protection of Paul, but to no purpose. Gamaliel leads him off triumphantly as the red rays of the rising sun light up the hill with its gruesome mounds and crosses.)

Marullus: Honoured fathers, I believe all of us have here suffered defeat.

Rabbi Shimon: The righteous one of Israel leads Israel's apostate by the hand!

Rabbi Zaddok: A sign of the end.

Marullus (to himself): A special messenger to Caligula is on the way.

CURTAIN.

The next scene takes place in the Palace of the High Priest. Rabbi Zaddok and the High Priest are together in a large hall of the Palace, through the large round window of which can be seen the noble masses of the Temple over which hangs a heavy black cloud.

The eve of the Day of Atonement is far advanced, and these two old men walk up and down in grief and anxiety over the events of the last few days in Jerusalem. Chanan, the High Priest's elder son, has fled from Roman justice, and no news of him is forthcoming; while the younger Mathias has fled with a Greek dancer. The High Priest contemplates his heavy Day of Atonement duties with fear and misery, feeling too heart-broken to face them. The scene is most moving. Rabbi Huna enters with further bad news: Marullus has closed all the synagogues, imprisoned the elders, and confiscated the moneys. The dark clouds over the Temple seem to these agitated minds to portend disaster. The High Priest: "I have sent for Gamaliel." "Gamaliel? He entertains blasphemy in his own house," says Rabbi Huna, who has brought a warrant for the arrest of Paul. He urges the High Priest to put his name to it, and so end all troubles by the execution of the source of them.

Rabbi Shimon enters. The High Priest questions him eagerly for news of Chanan. He brings news of more and more disasters: the Roman troops are occupying fresh places. Rabbi Huna presses the High Priest to sign the warrant. The High Priest enquires why Gamaliel has not come, according to custom, to be present at the vesting.

To the astonishment of all, Shimon tells them that his father is deep in studying the records concerning Jesus of Nazareth.

"With Saul?" they question. But he assures them that the two have not met or communicated in any way. "Father reads, reads, reads, day and night. Today, at morning prayer, suddenly a thought held him spellbound and he left the benediction unfinished. . . ." Their consternation is great. Their exclamations are interrupted by a sound of sobbing which proceeds from Rabbi Meir, who is discovered behind the door curtains. After a time he manages to stammer out the news that the persecution of the Jews is begun all over the Empire. "Ten thousand have been murdered in Alexandria alone."

"These are the birth-pangs of the Messiah," says Rabbi Zaddok. Rabbi Huna urges all these calamities as a further proof of the wrath of God that a blasphemer like Paul is allowed to live.

The High Priest, after much hesitation, signs the warrant at last. "I feel as though I had condemned my own children," says he. Then a great noise, followed by long-continued murmuring, is heard. Pinchas, all ragged and worn, comes in and falls at the High Priest's feet, and tells the dreadful news: Chanan has hanged himself in the desert. Even now his poor body is below in the courtyard. At first the father cannot grasp the import of these words. "He is not dead. Let us go and see him."

But as he goes the priests enter with the robes. The High Priest is torn between love and duty. At last he allows the robing to proceed without further delay. The Chief of the Priests chants the usual sentences over each garment, to point the symbolism. In his glorious golden vestments the High Priest stands motionless, with tears running down his aged cheeks. Loud music is heard from the Temple. This ends the fifth scene.

The last scene is set in the Temple, in the great chamber of the priests. In a corner is a high throne-like seat, on a table priestly utensils. It is the Day of Atonement, and the sound of the murmur of the people at prayer ebbs and flows in the room.

Paul and Barnabas enter, both wearing shrouds, which was customary for every Jew to do, from the High Priest downwards, on that day of contrition. Barnabas urges Paul to leave Gamaliel's house, and tells him of the warrant issued by the High Priest.

Paul: I know it, but another warrant hangs over me. Without Christ the world has two ways, in Christ one alone.

Barnabas is urgent in his pleading, but Paul says: "Not yet."

Barnabas: I have prepared everything. We will steal away to Bezetha to the house of a friend. Greek garments lie in readiness there.

So away with us at once into the darkness! *(Breaking out wildly)* How have I shaken off all this—Temple, sin, the Law—through thy assistance! Free am I, Paul! Free from this place of the rich, the oppressors, and the priests! Our Lord is the Christ of the poor! Let them dare! Let them try to take hold of thee! Him and thee will I protect. *(He goes to where the priestly utensils are and takes up a knife.)* And this sacrificial knife will I take with me!

Paul: Thou sinful man! Lay it down at once!

(Barnabas backs under the glance of Paul, and obeys.)

Paul: Woe unto thee—not for sin have we been freed, man. We are Jews of Christ. Pray that Gamaliel's soul may be opened. I shall speak, but for the truth of Christ there is no other proof than grace alone can vouchsafe.

When Gamaliel comes into the room Barnabas leaves Paul alone with him. Gamaliel seats himself on the throne-like chair, and Paul, kissing his hand, sits on the steps at his feet.

He prepares to explain himself to Gamaliel. He begins with the day when, as a care-free child, he was brought to this, his spiritual father. He goes on to describe how the Law soon made him lose his care-free spirit, and how he was, as it were, surrounded with thousands and millions of blazing swords in the world that formerly had seemed an easy, happy place. With rigorous fasting and prayer all the years did he then attempt to conquer self in mind, heart, and body, but with no success.

Paul: Daily and hourly my death warrant hung over me. Who is the man who can love his death warrant? The Law redeemed me not, it cursed me only with the knowledge of my sin.

Gamaliel: Speak not of it.

Then Paul speaks of Gamaliel himself, of his greatness, his righteousness.

Paul: One Being only the earth has held whom thou resemblest.

Gamaliel: Speak not of me.

Paul goes on to describe how in his love and despair he tried more and more to be like Gamaliel, who so lavishly dealt out to him spiritual food. "But I was starving and could not digest the King's food." Thus comparing himself in the depths with Gamaliel, who was able to live on the heights, he came to hate his teacher, was jealous of his purity and power, and so fled to the Zealots.

Paul: Thus it came about that the disciple of Gamaliel led young Stephen to be stoned. For in proportion to the death in us so is the will to murder in us.

Gamaliel: Speak of that which thou shouldst speak!

Paul (springing to his feet and speaking with great emotion): How can I speak of Him, Rabbann! How can I speak of the moment when I

entered, blind, into a new world? My heart is torn when I only think of it. Can a man speak of the moment of his birth?

Gamaliel: Thou wilt speak. For I have decided that thou shouldst lead back Rabbi Jehoshua of Nazareth to Israel.

Paul is overjoyed; he only fears for Gamaliel the result of such a deed. But Gamaliel is sure that false judgment has been passed upon Jesus, and that He has suffered an undeserved death. More than that, Gamaliel declares that this Jesus illumined the Law, but dangerously, because it was too premature, "for even illumination is guilty when it is too dazzling for weak eyes." Paul insists He did more than *illumine* the Law. Gamaliel avers that is an impossibility. "No Jew can live, think, or say what is not already sealed in God's word."

Paul: The dispensation of the Word is past.

Gamaliel accounts this blasphemy.

Paul: Rabbanu! A strange Being breathes in our midst. We draw in His breath with every breath we breathe. Grasp this mystery! Everything is now filled with His breath also. When I was the old Saul, between me and Creation there was a dead, black atmosphere—Loneliness! Death was the second name of the world. Death—all smiling, all filling earth scents; jeering, stinking death! And now? Why has Loneliness vanished? What is this strong exulting love in me? Whence cometh this knowledge of eternity in the heart, that consumes all fear and decay? A transformation! I tell thee, no smallest blade grows now untransformed. Even thou also, master, art transformed! For we live now in the midst of the Kingdom of God and know it not. . . .

Gamaliel (rising): Saul! . . . Thou art in the Temple. . . . We wear shrouds. . . . Think of the atonement which I would make on this Day of Atonement! (*Quietly but firmly*) What has the love of thy Jesus changed? It has changed nothing, as His anger changed nothing. He overthrew the moneylenders' tables in the Temple, but on the next day they stood there again. Not He, and not I, can banish evil, only the Law, that mystery that we serve that we may live, the holy Tie which binds mankind.

Paul: This Tie has become rotten, Rabbanu! Like a discarded wineskin the Word lies upon the road!

Gamaliel (with a deliberate composure): This this man Jesus did not say!

Paul: Rabbanu speaketh of a man! Oh, the world is swallowed up, both Jews and Gentiles, and only thou art here, thou and He. Gladly would I be anathema from Him, if thou, Israel's hero, now, shouldst know Him. A man? Has ever a man conquered death and decay? Has ever a man risen bodily from the dead? The Light which spoke to me before Damascus, was it a man? Was it a man that delivered me from myself? Can a man grant God's renewing grace? No, Rabbanu! He was not merely a man! He wore Manhood as a garment, as thou and I wear these shrouds. He, the Messiah, the incarnate Shekina, God's Son, He was before the world came into being. . . .

Gamaliel (coming towards Paul, breathing heavily): Saul, say that He was a man, for thine own sake and mine!

Paul: How can I? From man new birth cometh not.
Gamaliel: From man alone it cometh! For this Temple's sake, say that He was a man!

Paul: Not in the Temple, but on the Cross was the Blood of the Atonement shed. Now is the whole world the Temple of the great Sacrifice.

Gamaliel: Saul! Here I stand before thee. Not yet has the immeasurable calamity taken place! Destroy not my work of peace! The Messiah hath not come, for the ever-coming is He! Thou hast never understood the Torah, bad disciple thou! Only in its star-immersing depth abides the Kingdom of God and our ability to achieve it. Where the Torah ruleth not there is a wilderness and chaos! Do not force a strange spirit between God and Israel's freedom! For Israel's freedom's sake, say that He was a man!

Paul: Rabbanu, by the living God I implore thee: Believe! In this hour, not for anyone's sake can I lie.

Gamaliel: Woe unto thee! Knowest thou who the Messiah is? He is annihilation. For when this arrow flies the bow will break. I will not see Him. . . .

Paul (after an awful pause, in a whisper, jerkily): The bow is broken, O Israel! And for ever!

Gamaliel: Traitor! (As if unconsciously) Ten thousand crucified ones against one. . . . (He produces a cloth). Here! This bloody cloth, blasphemer! 'Tis not prophets' blood! Child's blood! Children slaughtered in Alexandria! They would not be traitors to the Torah! Thou pratest of the Messiah and of love, thou cold Satan, who lovest nothing, nothing, nothing! (Overcome, he presses the cloth to his face.) Children—singing they died. Singing, they died for the Torah. . . .

(The prayer of the people behind the scene increases in volume mightily.

Many voices chant verses of the Psalm with groaning, wailing, or wavering altogether confusedly.)

Gamaliel (with fixed eyes, muttering the penitentiary Psalm as if he had become the concentrated voice of the people): Hide not thy face from me. . . . For my days are consumed like smoke. . . . My bones are burnt up as with a firebrand. . . . My heart is dried up and withered like grass. . . . For the voice of my groaning bones will scarce cleave to my flesh. . . . I am become like the pelican in the wilderness, and like an owl that is in the desert. . . . Even as if it were a sparrow that sitteth alone upon the house-top. . . . Mine enemies revile me. . . . (He falters, pulls himself together, and walks towards the priestly utensils.) I retract my decision concerning Jesus of Nazareth! Perhaps He was a holy prophet, but I call Him enemy! The old contradiction is He, the rebellion in lamb's wool. The Rabbis were wise and not I. There can be no peace! And thee I tear out of my heart, thou destroyer, thou drunken apostate! And that thou mayest know who thou art, I give thee thy name: "Israel's self-hatred!" (He grasps the sacrificial knife.) The angel of Death between us, Saul!

Paul (bowing low): Here I am, Rabbanu! The death of Stephen has made a seer of me also.

Gamaliel: I shall not deliver thee to justice. Let no more blood be spilt over Israel! For the sake of the people I take upon myself the triple great sin: the desecration of the Sabbath, the defilement of the Temple, and murder! (He approaches Paul.)

(A long and urgent trumpet blast.)

Gamaliel : Behold, my God, I have done everything to save this soul. His youth I have nourished; he fell away: I wounded him. I have accepted his blasphemies. I have saved him from the judgment of men. For the sake of the peace of Thy Creation I wished to return this soul and its master into Thine house. Oh, I have been mocked! Can I let Thine enemy go, my God? Let him go to a strange land, him, who wishes to destroy Thine inexhaustible Torah and our holy responsibility towards men, in order that he may preach his phantom gospel? Oh, they will listen to him, and the phantom will become their Law, for a shadow lies but lightly, but Thy Law lies heavily! Lord, what shall I do? Should I perpetrate the horrible sin here in Thy Temple, in this breathless hour of the world? In this hour in which Thou numberest souls, should I destroy one?

(Short trumpet blasts sound from all sides.)

Gamaliel : The priests' trumpets blow on high to blast the walls of Thy Solitude! Men wail for their lives. The moment of decision has come. Never hast Thou forsaken me in this moment, Lord of the world! I have always come before Thee on the Day of Atonement with my pleading, and, with Thy loving voice, which I know so well, Thou hast shed abroad the answer in my heart. . . . Answer me now! . . . Who is Jesus of Nazareth? . . . Answer! . . . What should I do? . . . Who is Jesus whom they call the Messiah? . . . Has the Messiah come? . . . Have we profaned Thy light? . . .

(Trumpet blasts, always shorter and wilder. Paul, pale, fixed, with closed eyes, as if in a trance.)

Gamaliel (stamping imperiously) : Answer!

(A long trumpet blast, which dies away slowly. Deep silence, long and breathless.)

Gamaliel : No answer! For the first time, no answer! Empty am I like death!

Paul (softly and fervently) : I have received the answer, Rabbanu! Here am I!

Gamaliel (suddenly quite collapsed) : I know the Truth no more. . . . Go! *(He lets the knife fall.)*

Paul (suddenly falling on his knees) : Take it from me, Rabbanu! Here is my people, here my house. What should I accomplish in the world, I, a poor weak Jew? *(He takes Gamaliel's hand and presses it to his forehead.)* Yes, I have seen God's answer! I was wafted into dusty streets. In harbours I saw ships come and go; sailors sang. I stood among the throng in a great city and ever must I go—go—go! For the Christ is a tireless hunter.

Gamaliel (as though out of a far-off dream) : "Go—go—go." . . . Was this thine answer?

Paul : Now that I know it, I wish I might sleep and be no more. *(Barnabas stands at the entrance.)*

Gamaliel (seeming to have just awakened, and in perplexity) : Who art thou, Jew? *(Letting his hand rest heavily on Paul's head)* Whosoever thou art, man, the Lord bless thee, the Lord keep thee, the Lord make His face to shine upon thee. . . .

Barnabas : 'Tis the blessing of the priests.

Paul : Thou givest me the strength for the way. *(Rises, and walking backwards, keeping his eyes on Gamaliel the whole time.)* "Setting sun of my people. . . ."

[Exit with Barnabas.]

Gamaliel (his face becoming slowly distorted, calls out): The Destruction upon us! The Destruction. . . . (He stumbles cut with a covered face, his cry dying away in the distance.)

Rabbis Shimon and Huna now come in. They are full of distress, for the scapegoat has returned from the wilderness where it had been led. "God has not accepted the sacrifice, that is clear." Simon Peter, James, and two Nazarenes come forward. They speak together of the rejected sacrifice.

Peter: Seest thou, Paul was right. Every sacrifice of the Law is rejected, for the Son of God was sacrificed.

Shrill military music announces the presence of Roman armies marching in the distance. All present are shaken and pale. Marullus and Frisius enter with a company of soldiers, a surging crowd behind them. The horrified Rabbis demand an explanation of their presence in the holy inner courts of the Temple. "The punishment is death."

The people cry, "Back, death to the Romans!" But Marullus ascends the steps of the raised seat and waves a parchment. The High Priest enters in his robes. He is assisted by the priests, for he is scarcely able to stand. The people fall back, and a space opens between him and Marullus. The High Priest gathers himself together and commands Marullus, in the name of God, to leave the Holy Temple. Marullus politely informs him that they are all on Roman ground. He is still his courteously mocking self as he tells them of the edict of the divine Cæsar Caligula "which annuls all their privileges." There are shouts of "Enemy of God!" But Marullus, waiting calmly for silence, quells the noise and reads the edict to the silent throng.

There is martial music which Marullus explains: "Petronius marches on to Jerusalem, bringing the statue of the lawful god with him."

The deep silence is at last broken by an awful cry from all the Jews. They cast themselves at Marullus's feet and beg for mercy. The High Priest reels and nearly falls. He is upheld by the priests.

A voice is heard: "Gamaliel will help us! Where is Gamaliel?" The cry is taken up on all sides. Marullus turns to Frisius and says in an undertone: "I am curious to see whether thy Gamaliel will today also play the rôle of being above all this."

There is an abrupt silence. The body of Gamaliel in his shroud is brought in by Levites. "Here is Rabbanu," announces Rabbi Meir sadly.

Marullus: Frisius, this man is invincible.

The people break into a wailing that is not less dreadful for being subdued, and it continues to the end. Rabbi Shimon comes and kneels beside the body. "Father," he cries, "why art thou so terribly silent?" The noise without rouses them all. Rabbi Zaddok shouts in a frenzy: "Listen, the catapults rumble, the storm-rams bleat. The flame roars. The plough crunches over Zion."

Martial music is very loud and near.

Peter (who has been a silent witness to this scene, turns to the Nazarenes, saying): The last righteous one has passed away. The Anti-Christ has come. Every promise has been fulfilled. (He is trembling with his strong emotion. He waves his hand feebly.) Go home. The Hour of the Christ has come.

CURTAIN.

P. P. LEVERTOFF.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LATE DEAN OF SALISBURY

Some months ago I was invited to read the enclosed and as an acknowledgment to some returning remarks in Dr. Kelly's article on Methodism in the June number of *Expositor*. In the end I declined but I want to say a few words on the question was originally given to me by the late Dean of Salisbury, and the circumstances may perhaps interest you.

In 1915 Dr. Barn (then Vice-Chancellor) was asked by Dr. P. G. Hardy (now Bishop of Exeter) of which I was a member to act as Chairman of a "School" for training Study Circle leaders in the Northern diocese. The week's programme included theological as well as educational subjects and Dr. Barn put all his scholarship and spiritual wisdom at the disposal of the school, besides giving personal help, by informal talks, classes and private interviews to the full dozen of us who were leading the circles during the week.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE have received a copy of "A Little Catechism of Grace and Freewill," entitled *Grace and Gift*, by the Rev. F. M. Downton. It makes an attractive companion to the same author's *Rhymed Instructions on the Lord's Prayer*, which has already been noticed in these columns.

Among contributors to the present issue, the Rev. Dr. James is a well-known anthropologist and was the author of the first essay in *Essays Catholic and Critical*. We publish below a notice of a recent book of his by Dr. Marett, one of the first authorities on the subject. This notice, and that which precedes it on the Rev. Percy Osmond's book on Veronese, are both significant. That "the best small book" on the Stone Age and the one existing English monograph on an Old Master should have come from English parsonages is a gratifying indication of the wide and varied culture still living among the parochial clergy.

We publish below two notes on St. Paul, which seem to us most suggestive. We are doubtful whether Mr. Richardson's view that St. Paul was crucified at Perga has very much bearing on St. Mark's defection, but it certainly appears to throw light on St. Paul's own life and the allusions which he makes to it in his Epistles, including the "stake in the flesh."

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LATE DEAN OF SALISBURY

DEAR SIR,

Some months ago I was minded to send you the enclosed slip as an ancient parallel to some searching remarks in Dr. Kelly's article on Monophysitism in the June number of *THEOLOGY*. In the end I refrained, but venture to send it now, because the quotation was originally given to me by the late Dean of Salisbury, and the circumstances may perhaps interest you.

In 1915 Dr. Burn (then Vicar of Halifax) was asked by an S.P.G. Study Committee, of which I was a member, to act as Chairman of a "School" for training Study Circle leaders in the Northern dioceses. The week's programme included theological as well as educational subjects, and Dr. Burn put all his scholarship and spiritual wisdom at the disposal of the school, besides giving special help, by informal Bible classes and private interviews, to the half-dozen of us who were leading the circles during the week.

(At one of these Bible classes someone asked, in connection with St. Paul's teaching about unity, how one should interpret Titus iii. 10 (a man that is heretical . . . refuse). "Well," said Dr. Burn, "I always take it as meaning: 'Don't have much to do with very spiky people.'")

He showed great interest in my own plans for future work, lent me books to take home, advised about further reading, etc., and ended by giving me this extract, saying: "If you are reading Church History, or theology, or trying to do anything for the Church, especially in the cause of unity, keep this passage in mind, and I think it will help you. It is so difficult in these things to see straight and to keep the right temper, but, as you see, it is a very old difficulty."

I have never ceased to be grateful to him for this, though even for an ordinary person it does not make for mental ease—and for anyone in his position loyalty to it must have been very difficult. Ten years later I reminded him of this incident, and he said that he had just been introducing a professor of theology to that very passage; so evidently he still regarded it as a sort of touchstone. [The passage is given in full on p. 75 of his textbook on the Athanasian Creed, but in small type and easily overlooked.]

At the same school Dr. Burn ended a lecture on the authorship and history of the *Te Deum* by a directly spiritual appeal, quoting George Herbert's verses beginning "Jesu is in my heart" in a way that none who heard it would ever forget.

I think that these two quotations, from St. Hilary on Truth and from George Herbert on the love of Jesus, give the key to the whole life and character of the saint and scholar who has now gone to his reward. If our own Church can still produce such men as he, one need not despair of it.

Yours truly,

ELSIE M. BULLOCK.

It is manifest that there is nothing which men have ever said which is not liable to opposition. . . . Though every word we say be incontrovertible if gauged by the standard of truth, yet so long as men think or feel differently, the truth is always exposed to the cavil of opponents because they attack, under the delusion of error or prejudice, the truth they misunderstand or dislike. . . . Enquiry after truth gives way to the search for proofs of what we wish to believe; desire is paramount over truth. . . . There follows an obstinate battle between truth asserting itself and prejudice defending itself; truth maintains its ground and prejudice resists. But if desire had not forestalled reason; if the understanding of the truth had moved us to desire what was true; instead of trying to set up our desires as doctrines, we should let our doctrines dictate our desires; there would be no contradiction of the truth, for everyone would begin by desiring what was true, not by defending the truth of that which he desired.

ST HILARY OF POITIERS.

De Trin., x. 1.

LUGALAMA, THE MARTYR.

DEAR SIR,

I have read, with much interest, the article in this month's THEOLOGY, by Mr. Milner-White, on "Canonization in the Church of England," and though it seems rather presumptuous in a layman, I am venturing to suggest that, when fresh Saints are added, the name of Lugalama might be included. He was one of the three native boys who were the first Christian martyrs in Uganda, and, with his companions, was

slowly burnt alive on the 30th January, 1885. He was the youngest of the three, and perhaps the name of one of his companions should be substituted, but they are not given in the books I have consulted.* I make this suggestion for three reasons.

First, he was a *boy Saint*, aged about fifteen, and it is a pity we have so few young Saints (boys and girls) in the Calendar. The older martyrs are, of course, worthy of all honour; but when a man of seventy gives up his life for Christ he is, after all, only giving up the few remaining years, while, when a boy of fifteen does so, he is practically surrendering his whole life.

Secondly, he was a *modern Saint*. I have always thought (with Mr. Milner-White) that it is unfortunate we have no modern Saints in the Calendar. Saints who lived a thousand years ago, when the world was so different from what it is today, are not so useful as examples, and there is often some uncertainty as to their lives, but with a modern Saint all this is changed. There is no doubt as to the martyrdom of this boy, and there are sure to be persons still living who knew him.

Thirdly, he was a *coloured Saint*. This may, perhaps, raise some opposition, and I can only speak for myself, but though I know nothing of Uganda, I have known South Africa, off and on, for over forty years, and had a great deal to do with natives all through the Boer War. Many of them, as far as I could judge, were very good Christians, and I should be glad to see some native churches dedicated to the martyr-boy, *Saint Lugalama*.

Of course, it may be replied that if an African martyr is included in the Calendar, a Chinese one might be included as well. But why not? Would not our Calendar be enriched if it included the names of some of the first native martyrs belonging to the English Church in Africa, China, India and elsewhere? It would tend to emphasize the Catholicity of the Church, and be an encouragement to native Christians all over the world.

W. H. TURTON.

November 15, 1927.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Analecta Bollandiana. Tom. xlv., fasc. 1 and 2.

This contains Fr. Delehaye's transcript of the catalogues of the MSS. in the seminary of Chalce, with an index of the saints referred to in the different MSS.—a most useful piece of work. One is not without hope that when all the MSS. in Greek monasteries are explored some light may be thrown on the obscure question, Was Justinian really at the end of his life a heretic? Next we have a publication of the Georgian MS. 341 in the Library of the Historical Society at Tiflis, copied in 1919 by Professor R. P. Blake of Harvard. It is of a date before the thirteenth century, thought Mr. Blake. The present editors think it dangerous to date it earlier than the fourteenth or fifteenth. It contains a record of the martyrdoms of SS. Theodore, Julian, Eubulus, Malcamon, Maximus and Salamanes in Arabia Petrea in the time of Diocletian. Linguistically and historically, the story is of great value. A Latin translation is appended. We have next a critical examination of the texts for the Life of St.

* *Uganda, a Chosen Vessel*, by the Rev. H. I. C. Weatherhead; *Dayspring in Uganda* by the Rev. A. B. Lloyd; *Uganda Contrasts*, by Phyllis L. Garlick.

Godelius of Ghisteltes (Boulogne), c. 1050, a curious story of the murder of an unwilling bride by a barbarous husband; the canonization before the end of the century was, it seems, popular and recognized by local episcopal authority, not formal. Among the reviews it is noticed that from the *Acta SS.*, vol. iv., it is hoped to print the Eastern and Celtic Lives not, as hitherto, in Latin, but in the original tongues. Attention should also be directed, by the notice here given, to the *Liber Pontificalis* of Ravenna, vol. i., edited by Rasponé, 1924, which throws valuable light upon the lives of Ravennate notables of the sixth century, such as Julius Argentarius, famous in architectural history. It is shown that at that period the prefix *Cælius* was used as a sort of title by many persons of importance.

Tom. xlv., fasc. 3 and 4: If it were not that the numbers of the *Analecta* were always extraordinarily interesting, we should describe this issue as of exceptional interest. First Mgr. Francesco Lanzoni writes upon a subject which has, I think, hardly ever been dealt with in detail before—the dreams, of which so many are recorded, of the mothers of saints before their birth. He gives a wide survey, but he does not mention St. Thomas of Canterbury. The article is worth attentive study, for its historical, vagiologial and scientific interest. Mr. Peeters gives details of early Lives of St. Martha and her son St. Thomas of Antioch. The editor, Fr. Hippolyte Delehaye, not only writes, as always, a number of most admirable book-reviews, but gives a survey of recent discoveries and books on Roman antiquities, dealing specially with the "Sanctuary of the Apostles" on the Appian Way and its early history; and he also continues his valuable study of "collective indulgences," showing how their great increase was long regarded as an abuse. Fr. Maurice Coens, S.J., gives a vigorous and occasionally amusing account of the life of St. Hubert, criticizing certain late MSS. *Hupertus* = *humilis partus* is an excellent notion. The reviews in the *Analecta* are always valuable for their learning and impartiality. Of special interest to us in this number are those of the great Erasmus volumes of Dr. and Mrs. Allen, the recent books on the Merovingians (Dill and Dalton; there is a smile at Mr. Dalton for calling Gregory of Tours the Hercules of Gaul), Mr. Macdonald's Life of Lanfranc, and recent Lives of Becket. We are grateful for the critical recognition of English scholars, almost entirely a favourable one.

W. H. HUTTON.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

This singularly valuable organ of the University of Louvain opens with an important article by P. Battifol on the evolution of the method of consecrating bishops. He reviews the evidence contained in the Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian sacramentaries, the Roman *ordo* of the eighth century, the pontificals of Milan and of Rome in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Romano-Germanic pontifical, and the pontifical of Durand. The table in which the respective contributions of these nine sources is gathered is of quite unusual worth. In a word, Dr. Battifol has determined the essential elements in the liturgy of consecration of bishops, their origin and their date, and this of itself confers distinction on this number. L. Gouguad embarks on an exhaustive study of the *ordo monasticus* of Culross. His conclusion is that this *ordo* was copied at Dunblane before 1526 from a manuscript which has disappeared. He connects it with the psalter and martyrology of Richemarch. Father

D. De Bruyère writes a note on the "Itala" of St. Augustine. Father J. Van Mierlo discusses the attitude of the béguins to Lambert II. Then, employing unpublished documents, Father Claeys-Bouuaert describes the opposition of some Belgian bishops to the Bull "In Eminenti" (March 6, 1642). Once more we desire to emphasize the amazing worth of the list of articles in all the leading historical journals in Europe. To the historian such a list is simply indispensable, and we thoroughly congratulate the editors on the far-reaching nature of their labours in this field, which opens out such limitless possibilities.

R. H. MURRAY.

Theologische Blätter. November.

Prof. K. L. Schmidt reports his address on "The Problem of the Church in Primitive Christianity," which he gave at the first German Evangelical Conference, October 19, at Eisenach, and sums up his arguments on the meaning of the Church, the saying of Christ to St. Peter, and the relation of St. Paul to St. Peter in the early Church, which he put forward in his pamphlet, "Die Kirche der Urchristentums" (reviewed in the September number of THEOLOGY). Prof. G. Krüger reviews a study by Prof. E. Caspar on "Primatus Petri," which deals with Tertullian's argument about the purely individual authority of St. Peter and Cyprian's assertion of the primacy, not the supremacy, of St. Peter and his successors. Prof. O. Eissfeldt reports the International Conference of O.T. scholars at Oxford, September 27 to 30. Among the foreign members were ten Germans, three Dutchmen, two Frenchmen, one American and one Dane. Cambridge was represented by Prof. A. A. Bevan, and Oxford by Professors G. A. Cooke and G. R. Driver.

L. PATTERSON.

The International Review of Missions. October, 1927.

From one source after another come reported indications of the loosening of ties, both of tradition and of race, and evidence of the removal of barriers between man and man. This is a familiar social phenomenon in our own country; overseas, where there is greater mingling of nationality, it raises problems of racial and religious importance of which the ultimate issue is as yet not to be seen. In Turkey nationalism and the love of Western material advantages are fast cutting people adrift from Islam; and at the same time the philanthropic activities of Christian bodies are removing prejudices against the Cross (Dr. J. L. Barton). In Jewry political emancipation, the lessening of persecution, modern thought and materialism are relaxing the exclusiveness and the religious pertinacity of the Jew (Dr. A. E. Garvie). A "Dispersion" analogous to that of the Jews affects several European peoples; their subjects scattered all over the world in trade, industry, shipping and public services both cause and experience this revolutionary process (Miss Ruth Rouse). The impact of West on East has brought the many sins of industrialism with it (Rev. W. Paton). Seeing that the problem and the sphere of religion is humanity and its salvation, these phenomena offer a challenge and opportunities which should be self-evident. The problem of the utilization of indigenous customs is taking a new turn, and evidence is forthcoming that native Christians do not always share the missionaries' views as to its value and

desirability (Missionsenior J. Raum; cf. Rev. W. F. France in *The East and the West*, October, 1927). The Rev. R. O. Hall recalls all those who preach the Christian Gospel to reconsider its motive and inspiration, which is the purpose and the will of God rather than the needs of man.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. vii., Nos. 4, 5, and 6. (Article, "Climate and Religion," by Chester C. McCown.)

In the late war, at a certain important moment, a padre and a medical officer were found so deeply intrigued by a discussion of the influence of wallpaper upon character that they had strolled into an area where they ought not to have been. We are reminded of the incident by the suggestion made, in the double number of the *Journal of Religion* which marks its change into a quarterly, that climate has an influence upon religion. The suggestion is illustrated from the climate of Palestine. In Palestine, we are told, all depended upon the capricious smile of Nature. In Egypt the rise of the Nile could be accounted a certainty, and the rest depended upon human labour. In Palestine the "former" and the "latter" rains might fail, with consequences beyond the power of human effort to mitigate. Drought or storms, hot winds, mildew and locusts were enemies to agriculture against which the inhabitants of Palestine felt themselves to be powerless. The idea of God was therefore very present to their minds. People dependent upon forces beyond their comprehension or control are naturally more prone to believe in God than are we of this mechanical age when the necessities of life are brought to us with practical certainty. Should food or clothing fail, we should attribute the failure to some breakdown in the machinery of production or distribution, and not to God; but in Palestine the climate and its consequences just as naturally led people to attribute the failure to God, when there was a shortage of the things they needed. And if it were the hand of Yahweh, the reason must be that they had offended. It was a punishment for their disobedience. "Thus there developed the idea of a moral Providence. Doubtless the capriciousness of the Hebrew Deity was also partly due to His association with the weather. Remembering that many factors entered into the making of Hebrew religion, one cannot but believe, nevertheless, that the Old Testament conception of Providence and of God, both in its beautiful and its less happy aspects, was in part at least the product of a capricious climate." Geography, it is suggested, may also account for the universal intelligibility of the Bible literature, which is written against a background that can be realized in Central Africa as well as in Canada or the British Isles. "The remarkable variation of altitudes within the land itself adds to the bewildering confusion of its climates and the resulting variety of its fauna and flora. The tremendous rift of the Jordan Valley, descending below sea-level at Lake Huleh, and dropping to 1,300 feet below the sea at the surface of the Dead Sea, the lowest spot on the earth's surface, provides a practically tropical climate, where, as in the region of Gaza also, the date palm can flourish. Yet it is little over 100 miles to the eternal snows on the peak of Mount Hermon. This meteorological microcosm includes nearly all the earth's climatic zones and belts of vegetation." Such variations produced men independent, virile and adaptable, so that they made successful colonists in every part of the world. They prevented the Hebrews from becoming a dominant political or commercial power in

the Near East by depriving them of the resources for producing a highly organized culture or making any contribution to civilization in the realms of invention, industry, or art, so that their ethical and religious ideals remained the unimpaired virtues of primitive group life. "The limitations of Palestine on the material side, along with its ability to produce a healthy and vigorous race, led its people to high thinking and noble living, to lay emphasis on men rather than on things, to make their contribution to civilization in the realm of the spirit." In short, "climate was one of the servants of Him Who made the winds His messengers and flames of fire His ministers. It was not merely one of the 'pedagogues' to bring men to Christ, it was one of the chief teachers by which Israel learned the lessons which eventually became part of the Christian message." An interesting article, written with the modesty and restraint that befit a scholar.

H. S. MARSHALL.

The British Museum Quarterly. Vol. ii., Nos. 1 and 2.

These two numbers are packed full with good things. Brief mention may be made of the account of the Ur Excavation Exhibition which was opened in June in the Assyrian Basement and closes this autumn. Mr. Woolley's sensational discoveries of the last season come near to rival the finds of the Tutankhamen tomb. The gold dagger with its lapis-lazuli hilt and open-work gold sheath, the gold war pickaxe, the golden étui, necklaces of gold, cornelian and lapis beads, all dating nearly a thousand years before Abraham, are a rich haul indeed. It is good news that though the gold dagger and the étui are destined for Baghdad, the British Museum will retain its share of the other treasures.

A remarkable piece of work recently accomplished by Dr. Scott must not pass unnoticed. Solutions of celluloid applied by a soft brush to an Egyptian leather roll of the seventeenth century B.C., so brittle that it had remained unrolled since its arrival at the Museum in 1875, resulted in entire success; the manuscript has been completely unrolled without difficulty and without a breach in its continuity. This method will doubtless prove of great value in unrolling and strengthening ancient manuscripts on papyrus and other materials, and lead to important results.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

NOTES

WAS ST. PAUL CRUCIFIED AT PERGA?

Acts xiii. 13:

Those who were the companions of Paul set sail from Paphos,

And came to Perga of (the Province of) Pamphylia.

And John went away from them,

And returned to Jerusalem.

Many guesses have been made to explain the reasons for John Mark's desertion from the little band, and the reason why St. Paul decided to go northwards into the Province of Galatia.

Sir William Ramsay thinks that St. Paul may have had an attack of malaria, which decided him to go to the higher ground of the interior, and

that John Mark regarded this as a change of plan which was a departure from the scheme with which they had been charged at Antioch, and which would carry them into a region not contemplated by the Church.

Against this, we may suggest first, that if St. Paul had determined to plant a branch of the new Faith in Pamphylia, it is hardly likely that an attack of fever would make him at once give up his plan.

Secondly, John Mark was only the attendant, and, if this explanation is correct, he threw over both his superiors because he disagreed with their plans.

Thirdly, it presents him in a very bad light if he deserts his leaders when one of them is down with fever.

It seems to the present writer that some event of much greater importance must have occurred to cause him to take such a decided step.

Finally, he does not return to Syrian Antioch, from where he had his commission, to report his views about his return; but goes to Jerusalem, where we know there was a large section of the Christians who were hostile to St. Paul—viz., the Judaizers.

THE LETTER TO THE GALATIANS.

We therefore turn to the letter which St. Paul some two years later wrote to the people of Galatia, living in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, to see if he there gives any hints.

In the first place we note that he says:

Gal. iv. 13. You know that on account of a physical infirmity I preached to you on the former (visit).

Gal. iv. 14. And you did not despise or spit out that which was a temptation to you, in my body;

But you received me as a messenger (angel) of God,

Even as Messiah Jesus (Himself).

Gal. iv. 15. I bear you witness that, if it had been possible, you would have plucked out your eyes, and given them me.

Evidently we must look for some physical infirmity which rendered it imperative for St. Paul to leave Pamphylia at once and proceed to Galatia, and an infirmity which would naturally provoke contempt and rejection. Some have supposed, from verse 15, that this physical infirmity was ophthalmia.

But looking at other statements we find the following:

Gal. ii. 20. I have been co-crucified with Christ. And yet I am still living; no longer I myself, but Christ is living in me.

Gal. iii. 1. O senseless Galatians, who bewitched you? You, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was placarded as crucified.

Gal. iv. 13. You did not injure me (though others did).

Gal. v. 11. But I, brethren, if I still am preaching circumcision, why am I persecuted? Then the scandal of the cross (of my crucifixion) would be negatived—i.e., the Judaizers would be able to regard me as a martyr for the Jewish rite.

Gal. vi. 11. See with what large letters I have written to you with my own hand.

Gal. vi. 17. I (emphatic) am lifting up in my body the punctures of Jesus.

The Greek word here translated "punctures" is *stigmata*, and is used to denote the punctures often made in some part of a slave's flesh, to

mark him as his master's property, much as cattle often have holes bored through their ears to enable their owners to recognize them.

Under the Mosaic Law, when a slave voluntarily became the permanent property of his master a hole was bored through his ear.*

We have, therefore, St. Paul's own statement that he had been crucified.

Hitherto it has always been supposed that he spoke metaphorically in this passage.

Now it is a fact that he does so use the term crucifixion, when he speaks of the world being crucified to him. But when we read that two malefactors were co-crucified (the same Greek word) with our Lord, we do not hesitate to treat the word as being used literally.

It may be so here, or it may be metaphorical; and there is no certain proof to be given for one view or the other. But when we read that he bore in his body the punctures of Jesus; when we read that a physical infirmity was the cause of his proceeding to Galatia; when he points out to the Galatians the large letters which he has to form when he writes with his own (maimed) hand; when he tells the Galatians that he visibly portrayed Christ crucified before them, as he recalls the fact that they did not despise him when he appeared in their midst having apparently suffered the slave's penalty—is there not some ground for thinking that he may have been speaking literally and not metaphorically in this case?

The present writer by no means suggests that he was tried and sentenced judicially to death by crucifixion, but that he was maltreated by Jewish rioters, who, in revenge for his statement that their rulers at Jerusalem had crucified their Messiah, seized him in the open, flung him on to a handy piece of timber, and hammered spikes through his hands. Part of one of these may have remained in his hand, too firmly fixed to be withdrawn. Similar cases of maltreatment have occurred in other times, and even comparatively recently; and sometimes the victims have been rescued before death ended their sufferings.

Two objections will occur to the minds of many. First, why do we never hear elsewhere of this event; and second, why does he never elsewhere refer to it?

As to the first, he tells us in his second letter to the Church at Corinth that he was five times beaten by the Jews (judicially); three times beaten by Roman lictors; once he was stoned; three times he was shipwrecked.†

Of these twelve occasions, St. Luke tells us of two only—viz., the stoning at Lystra and the beating by lictors at Philippi. The other ten are never mentioned, and there has been no record of them preserved. This may be the case with regard to this event.

He also speaks of many other sufferings. Often he had been in prison (St. Luke in Acts mentions only one case, before the date of 2 Cor.).

He had been in peril of his life again and again, from Jews, heathen, robbers, and journeying risks. We hear of none of these from St. Luke.

But after the list which St. Paul enumerates in 2 Cor. xi. 23-33 he finally speaks of the greatest trial of all—a stake through his flesh,‡ which exactly expresses the result of a crucifixion.

We have also to bear in mind that the proconsul of Pamphylia would be most anxious to have such an event as the crucifixion of a Roman citizen hushed up. This, if brought to the notice of the authorities at

* Exod. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17.

† 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

‡ 2 Cor. xii. 7, R.V., margin.

Rome, would entail prompt and severe punishment, as in a case which occurred at Rhodes a few years before.

It has been suggested that St. Paul would be eager to display the fact that he had suffered as his Lord did.

He does indeed say that he always bears about in his body the putting to death of the Lord.*

But would a Roman gentleman have willingly exposed to the sneers of opponents the fact that he had (apparently) been subjected to the punishment of a slave?

An English missionary who had suffered severe disfigurement through his efforts for the Faith would probably rather undergo an operation to remove the terrible appearance of (say) his face, than feel that every time he appeared in public he must draw attention to what he had suffered in trying to do his duty.

Men severely disfigured in the Great War do not parade their disfigurement at the present time. They are not ashamed of their wounds; but they do not readily talk of them, and still less do they draw attention to them in a mixed company.

Finally, John Mark does not appear in such an unsatisfactory light.

We have to remember that, at that time, he could not possibly foresee the age-long success of St. Paul's new methods.

To a young man zealous for the enactments of the Mosaic Law, this crucifixion of his leader would most likely appear to be a Divine judgment on him for his infractions of the Old Testament Law, and possibly a warning from God to Mark himself, that he must leave the company of one who was departing from the Mosaic Faith.

Hence he leaves for Jerusalem (not Syrian Antioch), to report his action to the Apostles there, who are the acknowledged leaders of the Christian Church.

We understand also why St. Paul would not take him on his next mission, fearing that John Mark was not whole-heartedly convinced of the necessity of treating Gentiles as in God's sight on an equality with Jews.

St. Luke in his narration of the events lets John Mark down as lightly as possible, and says nothing which may lead to the punishment of the Proconsul of Pamphylia for alleged negligence.

THROUGH PISIDIA.

Acts xiii. 14. They made their way from Perga, and arrived at Pisidian Antioch.

In these few words does St. Luke describe that toilsome journey of a man still bearing the wounds of crucifixion, through the wild, mountainous, robber-infested districts of Pisidia.

It is probably thoughts of this terrible march which recurred to St. Paul's mind when in 2 Cor. xi. 26 he speaks of his journeyings in perils of rivers and perils of robbers.

This district is about the size of Wales, and more mountainous than that country.

Transferring the scene, we might picture the journey of a very sick man from Chepstow to Bala Lake, over mountains where there were no roads, crossing rivers which had no bridges, through a country infested with wild, lawless inhabitants such as Edward the First and the Lords of the Welsh Marches strove to keep in check some centuries ago.

* 2 Cor. iv. 10.

Sir William Ramsay* mentions several inscriptions still existing in this country, which record escapes or sufferings of travellers in those wild days.

He considers that the most likely route for St. Paul is that which passed through the village of Adada. The present writer suggests that it is not unlikely that the Church of St. Paul (Ayo Pavlo) marks the spot where local tradition has thus recorded the fact that here, about half-way through this terrible journey, the Apostle all but succumbed to the fever brought about by blood-poisoning, but where perhaps he was succoured and nursed back to health by some little colony of Jews.

We ought not to imagine any attempted evangelization of Pisidia. Probably there were no synagogues where he could preach, and but few Jewish settlers to whom he could proclaim their Messiah.

Further, St. Paul's policy throughout his career was to establish strong centres in large towns in the Provinces of the Empire; and Pisidia was a wild, uncivilized region lying between the Provinces of Pamphylia and Galatia.

A. J. RICHARDSON.

PAUL, A SLAVE OF JESUS CHRIST.

Is this chosen as a title of humility or of honour?

If it were a title of humility we might expect to find it in fairly frequent use by such a lover of our Lord. But, as a matter of fact, it is only used by St. Paul four times—in Romans i. 1, Phil. i. 1, and Titus i. 1 as a title, on one of which occasions at least he was writing with authority; and once in controversy (Gal. i. 10) he uses it to enforce the anathema on anyone who should teach a different Gospel. Elsewhere it is used by James (i. 1) and Jude and in 2 Peter.

The opening of the Epistle to Titus is "Paul, a slave of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ," and of 2 Peter "Simon Peter, a slave and apostle of Jesus Christ." Both these epistles are written with authority, and if they are held not to be genuine, but written by men who were trying to steal the authority of an apostolic name, would they be more likely to link it with a title of humility or of authority? An apostle himself, writing what might be his last instructions, might be expected to reinforce them with a title carrying with it a claim to obedience.

Are there any grounds for this supposition?

The apostles had been brought up on the Old Testament. To us the term "Ebed-Yahweh," the slave of the Lord, suggests the suffering servant of Isaiah xl.-lv. almost exclusively, and that in its application to Christ.

But though it seems that the Church very soon recognized in Christ the slave of the Lord of Isaiah liii., this was by no means the only use of the idea with which they were familiar. Its use in the Old Testament falls roughly into two divisions: (1) Israel in general is spoken of as "My slaves" (cp. Lev. xxv. 44, 45; Isa. xli. 8, xlv. 1, 21; Jer xxx. 10, etc.) or "My slave," but nearly always in a context referring to their humiliation and distress, and it is because they are the property of the Lord that they are under His special protection. It is that relationship which Israel claims in distress: "The dead bodies of Thy slaves have they given to be meat to the fowls of the air" (Ps. lxxix. 2), "Save Thy slave that trusteth in Thee" (Ps. lxxxvi.). (2) But its particular use is restricted

* *Church in Roman Empire*, pp. 23, 24.

to a few outstanding men occupying pivotal positions at turning-points of history.

"Moses, the slave of the Lord" is the almost invariable title of the Lawgiver. It is not applied to Aaron. "David My slave" is used even more frequently, especially in connection with the continuance of the dynasty, "that David My slave may have a light always before Me" (1 Kings xi. 36), and with his position in the Messianic Age. "My slave David" shall feed the flock of Israel (Ezek. xxxiv. 23), "My slave David shall be their prince" (Ezek. xxxvii. 24, 25).

There are references to "My slaves the prophets," but only twice is the title given to an individual, "My slave Isaiah" (Isa. xx. 3), when he was performing a special duty; otherwise it is almost exclusively applied to men of action—Caleb (1), Joshua (1), Elijah, very definitely a man of action (2), Nebuchadnezzar (2), Zerubbabel (1), men on whom history seemed to turn. The only exception is its application to Job, twice before his trials and twice after he had passed them (i. 8, ii. 3, xl. 7, 8).

The last and greatest example is the slave of Isaiah xl-lv., the one who is in future to do something which shall mark an epoch. He again is a man of action, "he shall not cry . . . nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets," but "he shall bring forth judgement" far beyond the limits of his own nation; and with him may be associated "My slave the Branch" (Zech. iii. 8), with whom is to come the removal of iniquity.

If, then, St. Paul and his fellows in confessing Jesus as Lord gave Him the position of Yahweh, in calling themselves "slaves of Jesus Christ" they claimed a place in the succession of "slaves of the Lord" with Moses, David and the prophets, as men whom God was using at a turning-point in His purpose for the world. It was a claim to be used sparingly.

But there are New Testament grounds also for the contention. We are so used to the parables of the king and his servants told by our Lord in the last days of His Ministry, that we overlook the points that they were *douloi*, and also that they were probably recognized by those who heard the parables as ministers of state. "One freeborn Roman could not take service with another. The Emperor had to fall back upon his household. His secretaries of state were slaves and freedmen" (Glover, *Conflict of Religions*, p. 35). For instance, we find in the parable of the Pounds that the slaves are put to rule free citizens. It may not have been the case so much among the local kinglets of Palestine, but St. Paul using it to write to Rome itself, to the Roman colony of Philippi, and possibly to Titus after having seen in Rome some of these same imperial slaves, may at least have associated with the title the claim to be one of those "slaves" to whom the Lord had committed the administration of His wealth, he and his readers knowing that such slaves occupied the highest posts in the Empire.

It is interesting to see the number of times "slaves" is used by the Lord who came to make men free, and it is worthy of note that the one time in which the King's "friends" are spoken of (John xv. 13-15) should be in the Gospel emanating from Asia Minor, where possibly memories still lingered of the different manner of the court of the Greek kings (cp. 1 Macc. ii. 18, iii. 38, x. 65, etc.).

Thus it would seem at least possible that in using the description "slave of Jesus Christ" the apostles were laying claim to a special place not only in the history of God's dealings with the world, but in the administration of His Church.

M. D. R. WILLINK.

REVIEWS

TEXTUAL DISCOVERIES IN PROVERBS, PSALMS, AND ISAIAH.

By Melville Scott, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This book was presented by the author as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Theology (Protestant Faculty) in the University of Strasburg, and approved by the Examiners. It consists of suggestions for a large number (about a hundred in Proverbs alone) of conjectural emendations in the M.T. with two essays (1-23 and 229-240) explanatory of the author's method. This method is so interesting and important that we cannot do better than endeavour to present a short summary of it. The author begins with the M.T. in its present state, and follows the *ductus literarum*. "No emendation, however otherwise inviting, should be accepted unless it can be recommended by its graphical probability" (p. 10). He points out that the Hebrew alphabet contains many pairs of letters obviously alike—e.g., ך and ך, ן and ן, ן and ן, and a corruption may often be restored by changing one for the other. A second source of error may arise from the wrong division of the consonants into word-groups or even into verses. "The consonants of such a passage should be written in a row and should be divided in every possible way, not forgetting to include the consonants ending and beginning the two adjacent verses or lines" (p. 12). A third source of corruption may arise through early copyists having by accident or design written the consonants of a word in their wrong order, and the business of the critic is to restore the original order. To these principles is added a careful use of the versions. "Far too great weight has been attributed to the MSS. and too little importance to the versions which, in spite of their grievous defects in scholarship, constantly give indications of a far earlier date in the history of the text" (p. 152). This method is not only thoroughly sound in itself, but more so in that it excludes the promiscuous guessing, the constant excision of words as "glosses," and the torturing of the text to fit it to a supposed metrical standard, which make some modern commentaries such distressful reading.

By the application of these principles Dr. Scott has obtained his "discoveries" or amended readings. It is impossible to pass a summary judgment on several hundred emendations—every one of them has to be separately pondered on. We do not profess to have examined them all, but we have examined every one in Psalms (pp. 93-169) as a test of the whole. They

reveal sound scholarship, great industry, and a good deal of critical insight. We will give a few specimens of emendations which we have found interesting.

Ps. ix. 7: For **היו בתימו** read **האויב תמו**.

Ps. x. 10: For **בעצמות הלכאים** read **בעצמות הלכאים**, "into the claws of the lions."

Ps. xxvii. 13, *init.*, read **לא האמנתי**.

Ps. xxxvi. 1: For **נעים** read **נעם** = נעים.

Ps. lxv. 8, lxviii. 8, cxliii. 6: For **מלח** read **מלח**.

Ps. lxxiv. 3: For **כעמך** [ל] read **כל**, "now all."

Ps. lxxx. 7: For **מנוח** read **מנוח**.

Ps. xc. 9: For **ראו בעלי** read **מרו מעלי**.

Ps. cxxxix. 16: For **גלמי** read **גרמי** (plur.).

The following have not impressed us so much.

Ps. xxx. 6: For **ירחם** read **הי"ם**.

Ps. xlviii. 2: For **ירכתי** read **רבת**, "greatly treasured."

Ps. lix. 13: Point **רבר** as **רבר**.

Ps. lxviii. 15: For **תשלג בצלמן** read **יה שגל בארמן**, "the queen mother cried out in the palace."

Isa. v. 1: For **דודי** read **דוד**, "a song of long ago."

These specimens are enough to show how suggestive and ingenious Dr. Scott's work is. We do not think this book will be of any use to the student who does not read Hebrew, but it will be read with pleasure and profit by any Hebrew scholar.

Both in this volume and elsewhere, Dr. Scott has expressed a desire for an official revised text of the O.T. as the basis of a new revised version (p. 238). We quite agree with him that without critical treatment of the text no revised version can be satisfactory. The shortcomings of the R.V. are almost entirely due to the fact that the revisers were not at liberty to alter the text even in places where it is unintelligible. But can it be hoped that any such consensus of critical opinion could be obtained as would render such a scheme possible? Even if all emendators restrained themselves by the same rules of graphic probability as Dr. Scott, they might not agree with all his proposals. And when we consider the enormous mass of critical emendations put forth by such editors as Briggs, Duhm, and Nowack—to say nothing of any others—and the character of the readings they propose, the scheme appears hopeless. As long as metric theories are allowed to control textual criticism, the text of the poetical books will be submerged in a sea of uncertainty, and anything like a standard revised text cannot be thought of.

W. W. CANNON.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By A. H. McNeile. The Clarendon Press. 18s.

Dr. McNeile's aim in this volume has been to give a conspectus of the material available for the study of the New Testament. "Historical, literary, and textual criticism, and the question of the Canon, require increasing specialization, which makes a whole library necessary for a full treatment of the New Testament." That is just the problem that faces the ordinary parish priest who wishes to keep himself well informed, but has neither the money to buy nor the time to read a library. Hence we cannot but be grateful to an expert scholar who places his store of knowledge at the disposal of the ordinary student.

Turning to the book itself, we find lengthy articles on "The Growth of the New Testament Canon" and "Textual Criticism." They contain a clear and up-to-date treatment of these subjects. Even if they make rather heavy reading, we know of no place where so much information can be found condensed into such a small compass. We may wish that more space had been given to a discussion of the part played by Marcion in the dissemination of certain of the Epistles of St. Paul. And can we be certain that the text of Polycarp, whose evidence is so confidently invoked on p. 312, has not been interpolated? The book ends with an excellent chapter on "Inspiration and Value."

We are left with only some 280 pages for the actual introduction to the books of the New Testament themselves. That we can only regard as a misfortune. It cramps the treatment, with the result that the writer's arguments appear arbitrary. He has, no doubt, reasons for all his assertions, but want of space forbids him to give them. Again, more conservative views often need more consideration than they receive.

His general position may be described as that of fairly advanced criticism. He defends the authenticity of Mark and Luke. The Fourth Gospel is ascribed to John the Elder. Acts is regarded as the work of St. Luke, and its historical value is admirably discussed. But we miss any reference to that most important work, the third volume of Professor Eduard Meyer's *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. And the suggestion of an early date for Acts needs more treatment than it receives. Of the disputed Epistles of St. Paul he defends the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and, with greater hesitation, Ephesians. He regards the Pastoral Epistles as incorporating, at least in the case of 2 Timothy and Titus, genuine fragments of the writing of St. Paul, but in the main as the work of a disciple. The evidence for St. Paul's release and second imprisonment he is inclined to reject. James he places at the

end of the first century. 1 Peter he accepts as the work of the Apostle. About the Apocalypse he finds himself compelled to be content with the vague conclusion that the writer was a Palestinian prophet who had lived in Asia. He hesitates about assigning the Johannine Epistles to the author of the Gospel.

The reader will find this volume a clear and accurate guide to much modern thought about the New Testament. We are obliged to confess that in spite of the excellence of many passages, we are by no means always convinced by the author's arguments, and his selection of points seems occasionally capricious. We are not sure that there is not a real danger of the revolt against what may be called the orthodox views of an earlier generation taking the form of a new orthodoxy which does not allow due weight to the facts on which the older views were based.

Thus on p. 272 he writes: "In Mark x. 39 Jesus said to the two sons of Zebedee, 'The cup which I drink of ye shall drink, and with the baptism wherewith I am baptized ye shall be baptized.' The obvious conclusion, which only the strongest evidence could prove mistaken, is that the evangelist who preserved that saying must have known that John, as well as his brother James, suffered martyrdom." That is a great overstatement. It might equally be argued, as by Dom Chapman, whose book is never mentioned, that if John had died a martyr's death, the tradition would have adhered to the text. Again, on p. 35, he writes: "Unless there was a second Lysanias, tetrarch of Abila, of which there is possibly evidence, St. Luke makes him tetrarch sixty-five years after his death." There is evidence of an inscription proving the existence of a second Lysanias, and there are coins that support this. The inscription cannot possibly be dismissed in this way, and its witness outweighs any amount of theories, however fashionable.

On p. 172 he leans to the conjecture that *Philippians* was composed during a purely hypothetical imprisonment at Ephesus. The arguments for this view are summarized, but they do not come to much. Inscriptions certainly prove that a body of the *Prætorian Guard* was sometimes posted at Ephesus, and that members of Caesar's household were at times buried there; but we should like more information about the date of these inscriptions before we can accept them as evidence for the years that St. Paul spent there. It is also a grave objection against the Ephesian view that there is no mention in *Philippians* of "the collection for the saints" which filled such an important place in St. Paul's mind at this time, as is shown by the letters which certainly belong to this period. We know that the church of Philippi played a specially honourable part in this

matter. On this and several other questions we hope that students who use this book will make it a starting-point for wider study. It is often possible to gain more in the long run from books from which we largely dissent than from those which only reinforce our own views. A book like this is a real defence of Christian faith. We hope the clergy will buy this book, study it, and on many points disagree with it.

E. J. BICKNELL.

NOTICES

THE GREAT PHYSICIAN. A Manual of Devotion for those who care for the Sick. Selected and arranged by A. J. Gayner Banks, M.A., and W. Sinclair Bowen, M.D., F.R.C.S. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This book is much more than it claims to be; it is not only a manual for those who care for the sick, it also has a great many helpful suggestions for the sick to use personally. There is a short office for spiritual communion to be used by communicants who are sick at home; there are meditations on the Sacraments, and a section of readings and prayers for expectant mothers. The spiritual level throughout is high. In the matter of spiritual healing, anointing of the sick and laying on of hands, and, indeed, in the ordinary work of the doctor, we are impressed with the emphasis given to the truth that it is God who heals, and that healing is only complete when it embraces soul as well as body.

In a few ways we consider *Pastor in Parochia* more helpful; its prayers are simpler, its meditations less fulsome. In *The Great Physician* there is a degree of verbosity which we are not used to—e.g., such prayers as "May the vibrations of my love reach that dear Spirit." But the book is exceedingly helpful; it is of interest to read it in the light of the report of the Lambeth Committee on The Ministry of Healing.

E. C. PRICHARD.

AN A B C OF CHRISTIAN LIVING. By C. E. Hudson. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

It is sometimes the fate of little books to be ignored. This little book by Mr. Hudson on the *A B C of Christian Living* deserves a kinder fate. It has a very definite message, and expresses an attitude towards Christianity which owes much to the present revival of interest in the mystical life, and which is utterly opposed to another tendency of today to look upon Christianity as merely a cult of good-fellowship, expressing itself, at its lowest, in much cheery back-slapping and, at its highest, in service towards the community.

Mr. Hudson insists that the essential factor of the Christian life is actual contact with Christ—a life lived "in Christ" by which one is enabled "to be more than man." He therefore gives two chapters to the Science of Prayer. In the first he faces many of the difficulties which hinder people today from learning to pray, and in the second, using a knowledge of psychology, he suggests a method by which the mystical art of recollection may be learnt and practised. There are certain features in his method

which would have made St. Theresa a little nervous lest sanctified day-dreaming should take the place of the soul's disciplined search for God. But much which he says is valuable.

The author has no use for the half-truths which are used today as infallible guides in religion. For example, writing of sin, he repudiates the statement that the modern man is not worrying about his sins. He claims that the exact reverse is the truth, and that the one thing the modern man is worrying about is just exactly his sinfulness, although he may call it by another name.

The chapter on the Kingdom of God and the Church reflects such movements as "Copec" and the I.C.F., while insisting constantly that the way to build the Kingdom is to fall in love with Christ. "A man falls in love with our Lord, and 'one loving spirit sets others on fire.' And then the Kingdom comes, not with *observation*, but as surely and certainly as dawn passes into day."

The least successful work in the book is the chapter on the psychology of the growth of the soul. One who knows the "Social Psychology" will not need to read it, and one who does not will scarcely follow it. Much of it is unnecessary to the working out of the theme of the book, while one wonders if Dr. Macdougall has said the last word on the psychology of the spirit.

There is thinking in this book which should not be lost. It could, for example, be used with advantage in Study Circles of students, who are in more danger than some others of being urged to adopt "back-slapping" as a substitute for the appalling discipline of "life in Christ"; while there are few of us who would not be better if we used Mr. Hudson's little book as a basis for meditation for a week or two.

E. W. SARA.

THE ORIGINAL JERUSALEM GOSPEL. ESSAYS ON THE DOCUMENT "Q."

By the Rev. J. M. C. Crum, M.A. Constable. 9s.

The book is precisely what it claims to be, a series of essays, rather disconnected essays, on the nature of the document which Luke and Matthew used in addition to Mark for the compilation of their gospels. The first three essays are introductory, and restate the arguments upon which the hypothesis is based that Q was a document; that its contents can be, at any rate partially, recovered from those sections which are common to Luke and Matthew, but which are not found in Mark; and that it consisted in the main of symmetrical, balanced, rhythmical, poetic sayings.

The essays which follow (chaps. iv.-vii.) are the important part of the book. The first two, "Q and Country Life," and "Q and the old Testament," argue the provenance of the sayings. They presume the homely village life of Galilee and an eventful active life set upon this background. The scene is not the city life of the Empire, but the open sky, the country air, and the carpenter's shop. And it is Jewish country life into the very structure of which the O.T. is woven. Solomon and Elijah are as real as the lilies and the plough. The sayings do not contain references to or quotations from the O.T. It lives in them. So that the reader, whilst reading Q with his eyes, must have his ears full of the O.T. The chapter on "Q and the O.T." is quite a first-rate piece of N.T. work.

So far the argument is that with Q we are in direct contact with Jesus of Nazareth. With chap. vi., however, "Q and Judaistic Christianity," the reader is quite irrelevantly and without any warning distracted from the witness of Q to the life and teaching of Jesus by being asked to consider it as a document in which primitive Jewish Christianity at Jerusalem is portrayed. The writer concludes his examination by stating that the passionate outcries against the unbelieving Jews reflect the opposition of the Jewish authorities to the Church in Jerusalem, and that the saying *Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans* "cannot be taken as even attempting to give a precise quotation of a saying which disciples remembered their Master to have spoken." Q was therefore composed by Jewish Christians persecuted by un-Christian Jews, and devoting themselves to the conversion of their Jewish neighbours only. This argument is precisely the argument used by Professor Bultmann to prove that the whole burning vigour of the anti-Jewish sayings in the Gospel proceeds not from Jesus, but from the primitive Christian Church in Jerusalem. When Mr. Crum writes, "I am not asking now what Jesus said. I am asking what were the Jewish Christians, who had found themselves as *sheep among wolves*, prepared to believe that Jesus had said," he cuts at the roots of our confidence in Q, and reverses the conclusions he had so carefully drawn in the two previous essays, and which in the last essay he draws from the passages in which Q and Mark overlap.

The saying which limits the Mission to the Jews is, of course, the crucial saying. Mr. Crum cannot imagine it to have been an authentic saying of Jesus, and his confidence in Q breaks down, though he will not admit it. But, what if the saying were original, and what if it belongs to that group of sayings which declare the work of Christ and of His disciples to be limited, hidden, confined, until the death of the Son of Man has been consummated, and which suggest that not until it has been effected can the Gospel be widely proclaimed?—*and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!* The whole essay on "Q and Judaistic Christianity" is open to criticism, and it is to be hoped that the author will reconsider his conclusions.

The important fact which emerges in the essay which follows (chap. vii.)—"Lucan Editorial Methods"—is that Luke is a drastic editor. He arranges his material, separating what originally belonged together, bringing together sayings which have no material connexion, and omitting freely. Not only is the order of Q more accurately preserved by Matthew, but many passages which occur only in Matthew are in fact Q passages. The argument throughout the essay is, however, unnecessarily complicated by the author's unquestioning assumptions that Dr. Streeter's theory of the double recension of Luke is correct. He does not argue for or against it; he takes it for granted. Since the material which Mr. Crum has collected is admirably suited for testing Dr. Streeter's theory, it is very much to be regretted that he did not undertake a critical examination.

Chap. viii. is a conjectural restoration of Q, and in chap. ix. the author discusses the passages in which Q and Mark overlap.

The book is an attractive book, vigorously written, and well worth reading. But it ends just where it becomes most interesting. What is the Gospel in Q? What is its theology and Christology? What kind of moral teaching does it contain? With these and other kindred questions the author has not busied himself. He is content with a literary critical

examination. Quite apart from the ultimate importance of the theology and ethics of Q, they have a reverse bearing upon most of the problems which appear at first sight purely literary.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNs.

THE SON OF ZEBEDEE AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By H. P. V. Nunn, M.A.
S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

We give a warm welcome to this unpretentious volume, strongly commended in a preface by the Bishop of Manchester. Its argument deserves the attention of all students of the New Testament. We are all familiar with the fashionable view that John, the son of Zebedee, died a martyr's death at a relatively early age, and therefore cannot have any connexion with the Fourth Gospel. The stock arguments for this position are reproduced in one book after another without any real re-examination of the evidence. It is the great merit of this book that it places the quotations on which the arguments rest in their context, and it is immediately apparent that the conclusions confidently drawn from them are far less secure than is often supposed. We agree with Mr. Nunn that it is unscientific to set aside the plain evidence of Irenæus in the way that is often done. We notice, however, that he translates *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*, "in my early youth." This is a very doubtful rendering. The phrase rather means "of undergraduate age" or "in early manhood." This seriously diminishes the chance of any mistake about the John of whom Polycarp spoke. And, indeed, if Irenæus had made a mistake, it is incredible that there was no one to correct him.

The second half of the book, which deals with the question of the authorship of the book itself, is less successful. The issues are more involved. But the author's somewhat boisterous criticism of certain modern views is effective. The work of destruction is easier than the work of construction. The full case for any form of the traditional view needs both more space and a more subtle treatment than this book affords. But it makes a really valuable protest against the tyranny of a new critical orthodoxy, which in some quarters it is considered unenlightened to question. The true reply to criticism is always better criticism.

E. J. BICKNELL.

FIRST STEPS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By Charles Harris, D.D.
S.C.M. 4s.

If students are (as they should be) a class who are fitted by their training to think correctly and to avoid sloppiness of sentiment or cheap and easy solutions to great problems, then Dr. Harris's severely rational treatment of his subject is rightly addressed to the Student Movement. We have had so many apologetics based on emotion and inner experience that it is invigorating to read a defence of religion based on Reason. We seem to breathe the air of the eighteenth century as represented by Butler, a time when thought was clear if religion was cold, a time which did not merit the satirical couplet in which Father Knox has stigmatized our own:

"When suave politeness tempered bigot zeal,
Converting 'I believe' to 'One does feel.'"

I welcome, then, Dr. Harris's defence of Reason, and his just criticism Kant's depreciation of the Understanding. The old "proofs" of God's

existence, which Kant thought he had exploded, were misleading, just because they were plural—as though any person with sufficient luck and skill might invent a new one at his breakfast. There is only one “proof” of God’s existence—namely, the persistent attempt to treat all orders of Reality as rational, and not as nonsense.

Dr. Harris is less happy where he charges Bergson with inconsistency in depreciating Reason, and yet using “every kind of rational argument in order to demonstrate his thesis.” As far as I know, Bergson never attempts to prove his system by logic, but always by an appeal to emotion and feeling.

The only criticism I should feel inclined to make on Dr. Harris’s general line of argument is that he follows Berkeley almost too loyally. Power, cause, purpose—all these ideas mean nothing to us except as the work of a Person. But surely the category of personality is not finally adequate for conceiving God. He is not just another Person up there in the sky, while we are here below. The doctrine of the Trinity surely implies that God’s Being transcends although it includes personality. I am the more surprised that Dr. Harris does not refer to the Trinity, as the best answer to Professor Pringle Pattison’s view that the world is necessary to the self-expression of God (which Dr. Harris so ably criticizes) seems to be that God finds this self-expression within His own nature—in the eternal begetting of the Son—not outside it, in the creation of the world.

F. H. BRABANT.

PLAINSONG ACCOMPANIMENT. By J. H. Arnold. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

This book is a notable sign of the times, and a very welcome guide to all who have to do with the singing of plainsong. At last this music is receiving the sort of recognition which, for its own purposes and within its own limitations, it deserves. Prejudices are vanishing, and the unworthy performance of this music, which prevailed in the earlier days of its revival, is vanishing. Mr. Arnold’s book will greatly help forward a proper understanding and performance. It does more than its title suggests, for the earlier part of it is a careful summary of the nature and theory of plainchant. In thirty pages the essential preliminaries to the singing and accompanying of the chant are well laid out. Seventy pages then are devoted to the inculcation of the right methods of accompaniment, and another seventy pages are devoted to a series of excellent examples, over and above those in the text. All this is as it should be.

Too often plainsong is regarded merely as a rather dull method of singing the psalms. In fact the psalm-tones are the least considerable part of the music. Mr. Arnold deals with this groundwork, but does not stop there. The Antiphons, the Hymns, the Ordinary of the Mass, and, to a limited extent, the Proper of the Mass, are all here taken into account. Perhaps hardly enough is made of the differences in style of accompaniment which belong to such different styles of chant. But the principles are the right ones. The accompaniment should be (i.) modal, (ii.) a minimum, (iii.) subordinate to the melody and leaving it free to take its own course. To these three it would be well to add (iv.) contrapuntal rather than harmonic. It would have been a gain if Mr. Arnold could have regarded it thus more than he has. The one serious blot on the purity of his taste and scholarship is his recognition of the bastard tunes made in

France in the eighteenth century with which the *English Hymnal* has disfigured its pages. But in every other way the book is highly to be commended. Organists will be grateful to Mr. Arnold for giving them this for their organ-desk, and still more grateful when, after having assimilated its teaching, they can safely dethrone it from that position, and give it an honourable place on their bookshelves.

WALTERUS TRURON.

THE EPISTLE OF ST JAMES AND JUDAIC CHRISTIANITY. By G. H. Rendall, B.D., Litt.D., LL.D. Cambridge University Press, 7s. 6d.

Dr. Rendall has given us an interesting study of a book which he rightly claims as one of the most interesting monuments of early Christianity. In a sense it is of a somewhat old-fashioned type. He does not roam at large through the whole field of classical and Oriental literature in the search for possible parallels to his text. On the other hand, he has devoted to that text and to the N.T. text in general a close and accurate study, for the lack of which the modern type of critic too often falls into the trap of substituting subtle and far-fetched interpretations for a plain and straightforward explanation. The only serious defect of his treatment in this respect is that he does not illustrate the Epistle from the *Psalms of Solomon*, a collection of writings which are perhaps as closely allied in spirit to the Epistle as any contemporary document. In particular *Ps. Sol.* xii. supplies an invaluable parallel to the very difficult passage, *Jas.* iii. 6, to which he devotes a note which is an admission of despair. The parallel does not indeed explain "the course of nature," but it shows that the conception of the tongue as a devouring fire which is to be destroyed by its own flames is simply taken over from current Pharisaical thought.

It may be observed, however, that the *Psalms of Solomon* in general confirm Dr. Rendall's contention that the Epistle is a genuine monument of the early piety of the Church of Jerusalem, reflecting the social and religious conditions of the time and place as we meet them in the N.T. and Josephus, and that the personal characteristics of the writer accord well with the personality of James, "the Lord's brother," as described to us by evidence which apart from the obvious exaggerations of Hegesippus is worthy of the greatest respect. The Epistle thus marks a stage in the emergence of Christianity out of Judaism which makes it one of the most important monuments of early Christianity. Dr. Rendall is not afraid of pointing out its ethical and religious values or of admitting its deficiencies.

The result is a very interesting and valuable study which we can confidently recommend to the student of the N.T.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

THE OLD LATIN TEXTS OF THE HEPTATEUCH. By A. V. Billen, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 15s.

This scholarly volume is a critical study mainly of three fifth or sixth century texts of (portions of) the Heptateuch—the Lyons, Munich, and Wurzburg MSS., including their Vocabulary, their relation to Patristic Quotations, and to the Greek text underlying the Old Latin Version, their style and their place in that Version, together with an interesting

Glossary or short study of selected words, and completed by a useful index of Scripture texts, and another of subjects.

The three Latin texts are brought into comparison with Augustine's two Treatises, the *Quæstiones* and the *Locutiones in Heptateuchum*; while the quotations from the Scriptures in Cyprian, Ambrose, the *Speculum*, Augustine, etc., receive full consideration. The term "African" is wisely enclosed in inverted commas, and used as equivalent to Cyprianic or primitive.

The author acknowledges his indebtedness to the Larger Cambridge LXX, and to two eminent scholars, the one of Oxford, the other of Cambridge—Dr. W. Sanday and Professor F. C. Burkitt.

As he modestly says, he may not have reached the goal, but he trusts he is on the right path—which is even more important. " 'Tis not in mortals to command success; we will do more, deserve it." The quotation is apposite.

W. E. PLATER.

PAOLO VERONESE: HIS CAREER AND WORK. By Percy H. Osmond. Sheldon Press. 25s.

Many books are being poured forth about art which are merely fugitive, and the majority of them are naturally not of the first class. It is a good sign that so much is written, and apparently bought, on this once neglected subject, for it shows that we are recovering a conscience in the matter and realize that art is one of the most serious ingredients of human life. But the book-buyer has to discriminate. Now a good rule in the case of books on art is to buy monographs, for they are interesting, and (if well done) valuable, and the possessor will find himself often looking them up in future years—when he travels, for instance. But many of us cannot buy all the monographs. Which, then, shall we choose? We may as well avoid cheap, small, and poorly illustrated books, and those about artists whose reputation is not yet established. Therefore the monographs to buy are those (1) that are sufficiently ample and well illustrated, and (2) those about the great artists. And who are the great artists? These at least: *Pre-Raphaelite*—Giotto, Masaccio, Donatello, the Van Eycks, Botticelli, Piero della Francesca, Signorelli, Giovanni Bellini. *After Raphael*—Leonardo, Correggio, Michelangelo, the Venetian Giorgione, Titian, Veronese, Tintoret, with the Spanish El Greco and Velazquez, and among the Dutchmen Rembrandt at least.

Therefore we needed an English monograph on Veronese, one of the biggest and most delightful of them all, and Mr. Osmond has done a public service in presenting his subject in a thorough, scholarly, and interesting manner. Veronese is "modern," in the sense that his use of colour is in close accord with the ideal of artists today: he invented a new way of colour, distinctive to himself, very lowly, and full of further possibilities; and therefore he was never so much appreciated as at the present day, though Ruskin led the way nearly a century ago—in this as in so much else.

This book is particularly welcome because there was practically no monograph on Veronese, Knackfuss' in the old German series (1897) being out of date and never very good. Mr. Osmond weaves in the uneventful and comfortable life of the artist very skilfully with descriptions of his pictures; and he gives us just the accurate information we want. We are glad that he does not follow Mr. Berenson's not very generous attributions;

although Veronese was helped a good deal by pupils, the magnificent compositions of "Happy Union," "Unfaithfulness," "Scorn," and "Respect" in our National Gallery are in execution worthy of Veronese at his best, and in design are completely successful examples of the rarely achieved art of allegorical painting. There are ninety-five illustrations and an invaluable Catalogue of Works.

P. DEARMER.

THE STONE AGE. By E. O. James. Sheldon Press. 3s. 6d.

It may perhaps be improper on my part to praise the work of a former pupil and one who has shared with me the delights—and I might add the perils—of exploring a lair of Neanderthal man, the earliest known proprietor or appropriator (for he had the cave-bear to reckon with) of a cave-home. The fact remains that, biassed or not, I regard this sketch of the very distant past of man as the best small book on the subject that has come my way. It seems to me to be thoroughly well-informed. At the same time it is very vivid in its descriptions, thanks doubtless to the fact that Dr. James has used his holidays well and visited many archaeological sites that to many of us are but a name. Finally, for one who like myself is chiefly interested in the life, and especially the inner life, of those fore-runners of humanity whose sparse remains—a bone here, a stone implement there—provide the sole source of our very tentative interpretations, Dr. James has the merit of speculating most ingeniously and without forcing the facts on those moral and spiritual forces that sustained our race in its struggle to emerge from mere animalism. I have no desire to enter here into the debatable question of human evolution, and indeed am of opinion that principles which science may legitimately assume for working purposes may well stand in need of some revision when a philosophical and theological synthesis is attempted. Be this as it may, however, wilful ignorance is no excuse either for assurance or for honest doubt, and the time has surely come when every educated man should know something about the earliest phases of human history, even though he be made uncomfortable by the thought of the age-long process that has helped to make him what he is.

R. R. MARETT.

SOCIALITY. THE ART OF LIVING TOGETHER. By Atkinson Lee. Holborn Publishing House. 5s.

The æsthetic is the central thing in social life; we are social beings, and only through the true harmony which the æsthetic can produce is it possible for man to reach his proper destiny. This is the message of a book which is certainly interesting and yet rather dissatisfying. The author shows us how deeply he believes in the purposive character of this world, and that the ultimate values are truth, beauty, and goodness. That it is for men to live together in the harmony of these values we would teach, but it is impossible for us to consider these values as anything but abstractions. They do not exist apart from Personality; more than that, they do not exist apart from God. And yet the author points to these values as the meeting ground of all schools of theology and philosophy; we have the vision of a Catholic Church worshipping an agreed standard of values.

Our Lord was a true Artist, both in His teaching and in His life of ideal truth; but our faith is not only belief in His teaching, as Mr. Lee says, but rather belief in His Person as the revelation of God Himself; nor can

we follow the author when he describes the Beatitudes as "the verdicts of a connoisseur in happiness" (p. 241). The "Blessedness" is not something which the persons feel, but the property ascribed to them in the estimate of God.

We cannot agree that heaven is the word used for "a universe containing many types of being, each perfect after its kind." Nor would it be the heavenly state, were the community completely loving and appreciative. Heaven is only realizable as the Presence of God. E. C. PRICHARD.

BOOK NOTES

Memories Grave and Gay of W. F. La Trobe-Bateman. Longmans. 4s. 6d. This sketch of a much-loved priest is mainly autobiographical. He was the first Vicar of St. John's and St. Alban's, Norwood, and Rector of All Saints', Ascot. In his ideals and practice, as in time, he was a link between the Tractarians and the modern Anglo-Catholics. It was probably inevitable that a book of this sort should deal with the surface life of "a very human saint." For this reason it fails to grip those who did not know the man. The many who remember him will delight in it.

Outspoken Essays. By W. R. Inge. First and Second Series. Longmans. 3s. 6d. each. The characteristics of these books are too well known to need recapitulation. They comprise essays written over a term of years, which are marked by violent prejudice, incisive and always lucid style, a wonderful power of exposition, and boldness which does not shrink from prophecy. Even when we think the Dean is most wrong we are forced to stop and ask whether our own view is as well-founded as we had imagined. It is a boon to have the two volumes available at so low a price.

Students and the Faith. Edited by J. W. Povah. Longmans. 4s. 6d. The sub-title is "The Call of Church Tutorial Classes," and the book is designed to set forth the need for religious education and the Tutorial Method of supplying the need. Bishop Gore writes a preface, and chapters are contributed by Drs. Matthews, Mansbridge, and Butterworth, Canon Durell, the Editor and others. A warm welcome should be given to this timely volume, especially as, for various reasons, its influence may well be less than it deserves.

The Christian Attitude. By J. Wareham. Mowbray. 3s. Described as "simple considerations and devotions for use in retreat," this book exactly lives up to its description. It should be very useful to put into the hands of a beginner in the spiritual life. At a later stage one hopes he would profit by more profound simplicity than is found here.

The Life of Jesus. By Ernest Renan. Dent. 2s. The reissue of this book in "Everyman" is to be greeted with mixed feelings. It is historically valueless, and as a work of imagination shows French bad taste, as real a phenomenon, though more rarely met with, as German and English. Jesus is sweet, the ministry is idyllic, etc. However, the book is valuable in that it was immensely influential in the days of our grandfathers and contributed to the forming of the prejudices which confront the Church today. Bishop Gore's preface points out the defects of the book faithfully.

W. K. L. C.

A New Study of Mystical Religion

MAN AND THE SUPERNATURAL

By EVELYN UNDERHILL, author of "Mysticism," etc.

Crown 8vo.

7s. 6d. net.

"We have nothing but praise for the present attempt to bring the fundamentals of the Christian religion into relation with actual experience."—*Guardian*.

THE FAITHS: Varieties of Christian Expression.

Edited by Dr. L. P. JACKS

5s. net each volume.

The views expressed by the eminent writers who have contributed to this series are specially important in view of the disturbed state of religious thought.

Write for a list of the published volumes.

The latest addition to the series is

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES

By Dr. JAMES MOFFATT, Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

METHUEN & CO., Ltd., 36, Essex Street, London, W.C. 2

*An Appeal to those of the
English Church who love
Our Lord and the Catholic
Religion, and will seek Him
in His Children*

THE HOLY FAMILY HOMES

Little Families—NOT Institutions
—of youngsters from poor homes,
no homes, or otherwise destitute—
with LOVE to guide and guard
them, and the Faith to sustain them

*Literature and all particulars from the Secretary and Treasurer, Rev. G. H. Barnett,
Holy Family Homes, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1*

Messrs. LONGMANS & CO.'S LIST

Recommended by the Bishop of London for Reading during Lent, 1928

CHRIST IN THE COMMON WAYS OF LIFE

By the Rev. C. S. WOODWARD, M.C., M.A., Canon of Westminster and Rector of St. John's. With an Introduction by THE BISHOP OF LONDON.
Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR

A Study of the Person and Doctrine of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Rector of St. Philip's, Salford, Canon of Manchester, Chaplain to H.M. The King.
Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. net.

THE ETERNAL LIFE: Here and Now

By the Rev. ALEXANDER NAIRNE, D.D., Canon of Windsor and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

[Ready February 16]

THE NECESSITY OF REDEMPTION:

A Study in the Significance of the Atonement.
By the Rev. PERCY HARTILL, B.D., Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College.
8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

STUDENTS AND THE FAITH:

The Call of Church Tutorial Classes.
A Symposium by Members of the Council and others.
Edited by Major J. W. POVAH, B.D.
With a Preface by the Right Rev. CHARLES GORE, D.D.
Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 3s. net; cloth, 4s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD., 39, Paternoster Row, London, E.C. 4

CHURCH REBELS and PIONEERS

By the REV. J. M. WITHEROW, D.D.

7/6 net.

"The biographical sketches of which this book is composed have been written with the purpose of making clear and interesting the origins of all the important modern Churches in Great Britain. In writing of every rebel I endeavour to write with sympathy. In describing the fathers of Congregationalism I am a Congregationalist, in sketching Hugh Bourne I am a Primitive Methodist, and so with all the rest. This line of treatment seemed necessary. I felt sure it would be hard to understand any Church leader and futile to interpret him to others unless the facts were seen and told from his point of view."—From Preface of this masterly work.

LONDON: THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY

Of all Booksellers.

T. & T. CLARK

NATURE AND GOD: An Introduction to Theistic Studies, with Special Reference to the Relations of Science and Religion.

By Professor WILLIAM FULTON, D.D., Glasgow.

9s. net.

"Marked by exceptional learning and ability."—*Scots Observer*.

FAITH IN GOD, AND ITS CHRISTIAN CONSUMMATION.

By the Rev. D. M. BAILLIE, M.A.

9s. net.

Traces the historical emergence of the idea of faith, deals with the general problems of the nature and basis of religious faith in general ("What is Faith?"), and proceeds to a consideration of the special problems and claims of Christian faith.

ST. PAUL AND PAGANISM.

By the Rev. THOMAS WILSON, B.D.

10s. net.

St. Paul—heir to a vast heritage of religious and moral ideas, Jewish and Pagan. To what extent the man and his teaching were influenced thereby is the difficult problem to which a solution is here offered.

AN OLD HEBREW TEXT OF ST. MATTHEW.

By HUGH J. SCHONFIELD.

6s. net.

"An important book. If its contentions are true . . . we have in this old Hebrew text our earliest extant MS. of any part of the New Testament."

DIVORCE AND NULLITY.

By the Ven. Archdeacon R. H. CHARLES, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D.

1s. 6d. net.

Recent controversy on the nullity of certain marriages as propounded by the Roman Church has led to this fresh study of the questions at issue from the standpoint of our Lord's teachers.

EDINBURGH, 38 George St. — 12 Ave Maria Lane, LONDON

THE HISTORIC MONUMENTS OF ENGLAND

Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON, M.A., Hon. D.Litt. (Durham), F.S.A.,
Professor of Mediæval History in the University of Leeds.

THE PAINTED GLASS OF YORK.

An Account of the Mediæval Glass of the Minster and the Parish Churches. By the REV. F. HARRISON, M.A., F.S.A., Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York. With a Preface by the VERY REV. W. FOXLEY NORRIS, D.D., Dean of Westminster. With four coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

Of this timely volume the DEAN OF WESTMINSTER writes: "Mr. Harrison has devoted years of close and loving care and attention to the windows, and brought his considerable and unusual amount of antiquarian and archæological knowledge to bear upon them."

The Yorkshire Post says: "Full of valuable matter."

The Yorkshire Herald says: ". . . the really great work. . . . The volume will delight its readers."

ENGLISH MONUMENTAL SCULPTURE SINCE THE RENAISSANCE.

By KATHARINE A. ESDAILE. With many Illustrations. Cloth boards. 10s. 6d. net.

[The writer boldly claims that the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century monuments in our churches are among the artistic glories of our land. The populace has always admired them, but the cultivated, awed by the prestige of the Gothic Revivalists, have scorned them. MRS. ESDAILE'S book writes a new page in the art history of our land.]

The volumes already published in this Series are

"ENGLISH MEDIÆVAL GLASS." By J. D. LE COUTEUR.

"THE CATHEDRAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND." By PROF. A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

"PARISH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE." By the REV. E. TYRRELL GREEN.

Each, 8s. 6d. net.

"SUNDIALS." By ARTHUR ROBERT GREEN. 10s. 6d. net.

S.P.C.K., LONDON

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

Early in the year it will publish a One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be assailed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership : Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows : Full Members, 10/- a year ; Associates, 2/6 ; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.